

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME X

JUNE 1915

NUMBER 9

## Editorial

### THE NEW "CLASSICS BUILDING" AT CHICAGO

After over twenty years of waiting and hoping, the four departments constituting the Classics Group at the University of Chicago have at last come into their own, and are now fully settled in their new building which was opened for their occupation on April 1. This is cause for congratulation, not alone to the classical men of this one institution, but to the friends of the classics everywhere; for, say what we will of spiritual sovereignty and the "kingdom of the mind," it is a decided advantage to any cause to have a substantial provision made for its material lodgment. Hence with this further splendid addition to its material equipment the cause of the classics goes on with new courage and inspiration.

The Chicago office of the *Classical Journal* is located on the second floor of this building; and this new stronghold of the classics will be further identified with the Classical Association of the Middle West and South as the place of its next annual meeting in April, 1916. Following is an official description of the building, taken from the departmental circular:

The Classics Building was finished in March and is now occupied by the four Departments of Greek, Latin, Comparative Philology, and the History of Art. It stands on the corner of Fifty-ninth Street and Ellis Avenue, just south of Divinity Hall, and is the west building of the group along the Midway Plaisance, of which the central feature is the William Rainey Harper Memorial Library. It has a frontage of one hundred and thirty-three feet on Fifty-ninth Street, and the space between it and the Library is to be devoted to a building for the Modern Languages.

It is built in Collegiate Gothic style, and architecturally conforms to the spirit of Harper Library. The material is Bedford limestone, and the structure is fireproof. Many distinctive features make the building one of the most striking on the Campus. The graceful lines of the arches, the oriel windows with their stone mullions and leaded glass, the carved finials and bosses, the reliefs of the cornice, reproducing scenes from Aesop's fables, and especially the loggia above the main entrance on the Campus side, all contribute to its aesthetic effectiveness.

On the ground floor are six classrooms of varying size, and occupying the whole of the west end is an assembly room, seating one hundred and thirty, for conferences, public lectures, or large classes. On the second floor are the offices of the professors, and two clubrooms for the Men's and Women's Classical Clubs respectively. These clubrooms, about eighteen by forty feet each, are wainscoted nearly to the ceiling. Each of the rooms has an old English fireplace, and kitchenettes for the preparation and serving of light refreshments at club meetings complete the suites. Both rooms are equipped for stereopticon lectures, and blackboards are hidden under swinging panels. It will be possible to use the rooms for joint gatherings by opening large double doors concealed in the paneling of the wall. On the third floor are the main reading-room, a room for palaeography and epigraphy, another for the photographs and plates of the Department of Archaeology, and offices for the Library Adviser and his associate. The reading-room is the most decorative of all the rooms. It is forty by forty-eight feet, with an alcove eight by forty, and is carried up two stories, the roof being supported by ornamental oak hammer-beam trusses, and the space between being paneled. The fourth floor contains a museum, thirty-three feet by eighty-three, and the editorial office of *Classical Philology*, the quarterly journal of the Classical Departments.

The stacks, in which are all the books for which there is not room around the walls of the main reading-room, occupy a space at the east end of the building, running from the third floor down to the basement. The total stack-capacity is about 220,000 volumes.

The official name is "The Classics Building: Hiram Kelly Memorial." The money for its erection was donated by Mrs. Kelly.

ADDRESS AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF  
THE CLASSICS BUILDING AT THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CHICAGO<sup>1</sup>

---

BY WILLIAM GARDNER HALE  
The University of Chicago

---

Our University came into existence at a time of great mental exaltation. The World's Fair was in the making. It was opened in the Spring Quarter of our first year. In the Convocation address which I gave at the end of that quarter, I said:

The power of the leaders of the community which is to be the environment of the University of Chicago has been shown in that fair vision of civilization which, calling upon the best genius of the whole country, they have evoked, for a few fleeting months, by the shores of the lake. But this is not their only work. Another and more lasting vision has in these same years been silently rising under the shadow of the White City. When, by the hard decree of fate, the walls of that city have been razed to the ground, the Gray City of enduring stone by the "Midway Plaisance" will remain—witness to a still higher and more disinterested idealism, proof, like the Art Institute and the three great libraries, of Chicago's deep-seated belief in the intellectual life. Here, in this city of the open mind and generous heart, in this city of dreamers and planners, in this city where the pulse of American life beats full and strong, it should prosper.

My words would have died in the utterance, had they, in Horace's phrase, "lacked the sacred bard." Our sacred bard was Professor Lewis. As he has himself said on a public occasion, the passage I have quoted touched his imagination, and the White City and the Gray will hereafter live together in the verses of the Chicago hymn:

The City White has fled the earth;  
But where the azure waters lie  
A nobler city has its birth,  
The City Gray that ne'er shall die.  
For decades and for centuries  
Its battlemented towers shall rise  
Beneath the hope-filled western skies.  
'Tis our dear Alma Mater.

<sup>1</sup> Delivered on the morning of Convocation Day, June 9, 1914.

His high visions and mine knew no distinction of department. They have been realized. The Gray City has risen, stone on stone, with unparalleled steadiness. The nightly lanterns of the contractor have been quenched as rarely as the gates of the temple of Janus were closed, in sign of peace, in Rome. The City White, on the other hand, has become little more than a memory. Two buildings alone stand. One of them, which now serves the humble purposes of a restaurant, is by that function saved for a longer life. The other, the home of art at the World's Fair, and the supreme pride then of all its beauty, as it is today of all the beauty of the park, is doomed. Why is it that many a citizen of Chicago will feel a personal grief on the day when the wreckers strike the first blow at it? What is the secret of its incomparable loveliness and nobility, even in lingering decay? It is its harmony of part with part, its restraint, its dignity.

This dearly loved building, which impresses even those who know nothing of its antecedents, is a lineal descendant of Greek and Roman art. That art has been worked over by generations of modern minds to produce the results which now so satisfies us. The building is no copy of any that ever stood in Rome or Athens. Yet if Rome and Athens had never been, this building would never have been. And if today someone should ask me, "How did Athens and Rome look?" I should answer, "More like the Field Columbian Museum than like anything else this country has to show. The Field Columbian Museum is Greece, Rome, Italy, France, and America. But most of all it is Greece and Rome."

The qualities of Greek and Roman art are also those of Greek and Roman literature. We dedicate today a building which is to enshrine these qualities in the life of the University of Chicago. It takes the form of the architecture of the northern races, to which our general style binds us. But in spirit it stands for the same tradition as the great building in Jackson Park. It is as if that dying monument had waited for the day when classical studies should have their permanent place assured in the University of Chicago.

How did this very modern city come to have such a building? How did this very modern University come to share in such a



tradition? Are these things revivals of something alien to us, or do they belong to our own inheritance?

There are several great civilizations in the world, each with its own body of great literature. But we are aware that the civilization and literature of India, for example, or of China, are not ours. Ours is the civilization of Europe. We know well where it had its cradle. The map of our old home two thousand years ago is the map of the Mediterranean basin, with Rome at its center. The map of it three thousand years ago is the map of Greece, the Greek islands, and the Greek settlements. It was here that the civilization to which we belong was first evolved. Here flourished an intellectual life of extraordinary power and beauty. Rome carried on and built up the inheritance, adding the conceptions of law, political order, and the common weal to the conceptions of beauty which had been developed under Greek individualism.

This Greco-Roman civilization was extended westward and northward through Caesar's conquest of Gaul, and, a little later, the Roman conquest of a part of Britain. The latter was transitory. The former was accomplished once for all. So complete was it that the Gauls accepted, not only the ways of living, but the art and language of their conquerors. Among the most impressive and most beautiful remains of Roman construction are the temples, the theaters, and the aqueducts of Southern France. And the language of France is today modern Roman, the direct descendant of the popular Latin of the late empire.

But Rome's conquest did not stop here. Though the empire was overthrown by the barbarian races of the north, the civilization was not overthrown. As Greece, in Horace's phrase, took her rude conqueror captive, so did Rome take captive later her rude conquerors from the northern world. The ways of Rome became the ways of the barbarian races, and the Roman empire, dying as a political entity, became the Roman empire of European thought.

For a while, however, the intellectual life subsided, under many influences—materialism, the shocks of the barbarian invasions, and the repressive power of an authoritative church. The establishment of schools by Charlemagne marks roughly the beginnings of a revival. Working under the supposed authority of Aristotle (of

all things in the world), but hampered by their creed, the justification of which was the main purpose of learning, these schools nevertheless served. The thirteenth century, a century of powerful men, saw a fresh stirring of human thought. In the early part of the fourteenth, as we know almost by chance, from comments in the margins of manuscripts, and surviving collections of choice passages, readers in the monastery and cathedral libraries began to range about among Latin authors who had long been forgotten. Then came, near the middle of the century, a group of men who eagerly formed private libraries of Latin, copying with their own hands, and engaging others to copy for them. The first great collector of Latin manuscripts was Petrarch; and Boccaccio was little behind him in activity. It is worthy of notice, as we pass, that classical studies and modern literature begin with the same names. Petrarch never attained to Greek. But in the latter part of his century, in Florence, there was appointed for the first time a professor of that language. In all the universities, professors of Latin were appointed. For a long time they were looked upon as dealing with inferior matters—as being in positions of lower dignity—and they received lower salaries than their associate. But they won the cause for which they fought. They successfully vindicated the right of free inquiry, the right of mankind to the rational and joyous use of this earth, and the nobility and interest to which human life had attained before the days of the church. Because they championed the rights of man, they were called “humanists.” In their triumph, Europe became humanistic. Thus classical education is not, as is so often thoughtlessly said, an inheritance from mediaevalism. It was the principal engine of *revolt* against mediaevalism. Classical education was the result of the victory of the free human spirit.

With the revival of the classics, called the Renaissance, modern science also was born. The first means to a freer scientific spirit was found in the translation of the observations and discussions of the Greek medical writers. From the same cause, the free activity of the human spirit, came the reformation in religion. From that time until now, the intellectual life of Europe has swept on in the current which had its source in Greece and Rome. This is the

inheritance into which we were born. This is why the most beautiful building in the country at the present moment is a building evolved from Greek and Roman architecture. This is why, in the laying of the cornerstone of the Classics Building, the spirit of Greece and Rome is to be established in permanency in the educational system of the University of Chicago.

But it is not thought and art alone that form our inheritance from Greece and Rome. I have said that, with Roman civilization, the countries to the west accepted the Roman speech. So completely did this triumph that, when the men of the north, the Normans, as we call them, descended upon France, they, too, accepted the civilization and the language of the conquered people. When they carried their power into the northern island, their Roman speech and language went with them; and we have the strange spectacle of men of northern blood imposing a Latin speech upon other men of northern blood. The language of England became a mixed language, made up of Anglo-Saxon and Norman French. To its vocabulary were afterward added many words taken directly from Latin. We ought not, then, to think of our native speech as Anglo-Saxon, with some elements of Latin superimposed; we ought to think of it, and speak of it, as *Anglo-Latin*. If we call Anglo-Saxon the mother-tongue of our race, then we should call Latin our father-tongue. No orator of today, no matter what his subject, will be able to escape this fact in the constitution of English. More than this, we have, in general, not taken Latin roots and built up English words upon them in our own way. A great multitude of the common words which we use, like "orator," "oratory," "oration," "oratorical," were formed in Italy some thousands of years ago. The men who were shaping them then were making modern English. In studying the Latin language as a language, then, we are studying our own tongue. It is strange that so distorted a conception as that which is commonly held should ever have established itself, and that the study of the Latin language in our schools should have come to be thought of as the study of something remote from our own interests.

But three apparently easy answers are given to what I have urged, two of them by a recent writer in the *Outlook*, whose open

cry is that, now that Greek (as he thinks) has been driven out of American education, no effort must be omitted to drive Latin out also.

The first is that, while Greek and Roman literature may be of value, they are to be had now in translations. But who applies this to French and German? Who says that what we want is, not the power to read French and German, but bureaus of translation, and that, while scientific students must have French and German in order to read the current journals, nobody needs a knowledge of them for general literary education? What man who knows his German finds in Bayard Taylor's *Faust* all that he finds in Goethe's? If there is anything that is sure, it is the untranslatability of any great work of literature.

The second answer given, by the same writer, is that all our present English words are in the dictionary, and can be learned from it. It is quite true. They are all there. But nobody, even if he lacks Latin, ever does or ever will learn them in this way. The child learns them through what he hears and what he reads. He builds up little by little a linguistic consciousness. But, with extremely few exceptions, he does not, without Latin, gain the linguistic consciousness and the comprehension possessed by the student who knows their sources and the powers of each part.

The third answer is a more subtle one. It may have occurred to some of my hearers when I said that the great building in our park is Greece, Rome, Italy, France, America. "We have inherited," it may be said, "all that we now have. But we *possess* this great art now. What difference does it make out of what sources it came?" It makes this difference, that no man who held this view could ever have designed the building. Atwood, who gave it its form, and the French architect who preceded him, were devoted students of Italian, Roman, and Greek architecture. It was through their deep familiarity with this architecture that they achieved their delicacy of feeling, their restraint, their repose. McKim, the founder of the American Academy, recognized this well when he established the American School of Architecture in Rome, in order that, there and in their visits to Greece, our promising young architects might come to know intimately the purest and

best architectural monuments of the classical style—the style which is obviously triumphing in the present architectural work both of Europe and of this new land.

And what I have said of architecture may be said of language. The student of modern languages should go back to the classics. The modern languages of themselves do not suffice. The finest and most delicate expression in spoken and written language today is to be found in French. The man who does not read French misses one of the keenest enjoyments of life. All this, I not only grant, but urge. What follows? The writer of the article in the *Outlook* already referred to says that our young people, instead of learning Latin, should be reading such writers as Maeterlinck and Anatole France. But what do some of these men themselves think about the matter? Let us listen to Anatole France:

For myself, I follow the fortunes of classical studies year by year with a keener and ever-increasing anxiety. French culture is the noblest and the most delicate thing in the world. It is growing poorer, and people are making the most hazardous experiments to regenerate it. How is it possible, at times so critical, to look without emotion at the little student going to school in the morning, nose in air, his books on his back? He is the future of his country, this poor little devil. I am distressed when I try to divine whether he will keep in full life the flame that has so long enlightened the world, or will let it go out. I tremble for our humanities.

Again:

To learn to *think*, that is the true aim of secondary education. And that is why I regret the loss of the ways in which Latin used to be taught in the language classes; for, in learning Latin in those ways, the student used to learn something infinitely more precious than Latin; he used to learn to shape and to express his thought.

Again:

I believe that, without Latin studies, the beauty of the French genius is doomed. All of us who have thought with some vigor had learned to think in the study of Latin. I don't exaggerate in saying that in being ignorant of Latin one is ignorant of the sovereign lucidity of expression.

All this is true for the person of English speech as well, if not quite in the same degree, yet in one of commanding importance. The web of our English literature is shot through and through with the threads and patterns of classical literature. And in our daily



speech, apart from the simple counters of thought afforded by the pronouns, prepositions, numerals, and auxiliaries, the Latin side of our Anglo-Latin Language heavily preponderates. Even those who urge the pursuit of subjects which prepare one to make an immediate living are obliged, all unawares, to call them by two Latin words, "vocational studies"; and the institutions in which they are to be taught have to be called by one Latin word and one Greek, "vocational schools." There is a deal of misconception on this point. A recent writer has said, "Avoid Latin derivatives. Use terse, pure, simple Saxon." But out of these eight words only "Saxon" is Saxon. All the rest are Latin. Science herself, indeed, bears without apparent discomfort a Latin name; while her nomenclature is almost wholly Latin or Greek. The International Congress of Botanists at Vienna in 1905 even went so far as formally to adopt Latin as the language by which all species should be, not only named, but described.

Closely akin to the helpfulness of classical study on this side of the field, and quite apart from its helpfulness to students of all modern literatures in school or college work, is its aid on the linguistic side to the student of French, Spanish, Italian, history, law, medicine, and divinity. Thus classical study, mistress in her own domain, is the willing servant to many another department of the arts, sciences, and professions. Has she not the right, then, to ask for the appreciation and sympathy without which no department can successfully work?

I have spoken of the artistic and literary aspects of classical training and of its service to the work of other departments. The day is full, and you are to pass to other things. I can but barely allude to another great aspect of our work, the scientific one, covering a wide range of interests—linguistics, epigraphy, paleography, political institutions, private life, religion. You must not make the mistake (so easy to make, because of our restriction of the word "science" when used alone) of supposing that we have gone to the natural sciences to borrow a method. The modern scientific study of the classics began with Bopp's dissertation, in the year 1816. The splendid modern spirit in natural science hardly goes back so far.



But I must not leave upon your minds the impression that we of the classics value nothing else. On the contrary, we are earnest advocates of breadth in education. We are glad that a colleague of ours, for five years a teacher of Latin and covering the entire college course, is now the head of our Department of Botany; just as we are pleased to number in our own classical faculty a man who began his career as an ichthyologist, and whose earliest publication was in this field. Physics, chemistry, geology, as taught in this University, are as truly cultural as Greek, Latin, French, German, philosophy, history. Only, there are two distinct kinds of culture, as there are two distinct kinds of science. And our creed is that every student of the University, wherever his controlling work may lie, should have something of the other kind of culture, and something of the other kind of science. We therefore rejoice that a fair sister to our Classics Building is rising at the same time with it, to be the home of one of the great natural sciences; and we offer congratulations for this building, as we render thanks for ours.

Our own home, however, will not be complete when the present building is finished. We are all of one sisterhood; but classical study has a *twin* sister, who is still homeless. The difference between classical study and modern-language study is mainly the unimportant one of chronology. The two proceed by identical methods. They cultivate the same great field, and their respective holdings in that field overlap. Men in each of the two groups work in the other also, and need, not only the supporting sense of nearness, but the actual working tools, of that other group. With our warm thanks to the memory of a citizen of Chicago, and to the sympathetic co-operation of living citizens, must therefore be joined our prayer to some as yet silent other citizen, the giver of the future home of the modern languages. And a part of that prayer is that, for both our sakes, he may not long conceal his name.

## THOUGHTS ON THE RELIABILITY OF CLASSICAL WRITERS, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE SIZE OF THE ARMY OF XERXES<sup>1</sup>

BY JOHN A. SCOTT  
Northwestern University

No field has furnished the needy searcher for theme of dissertation or original production a more certain harvest than the denial of the reliability of some classical writer or the genuineness of some commonly accepted masterpiece. Has the world regarded Demosthenes as a model of unselfish patriotism? Then show that he was the shallow demagogue who brought to nought the liberal and far-sighted policies of an Aeschines. Has the world regarded Cicero as the frustrator of the criminal ambitions of a Catiline? Then show that Catiline was the large-minded reformer and Cicero the cheap and paid trimmer, the tool of intrenched privilege. Nothing is sacred, nothing exempt, everything must go into the furnace, and the greater glory if it is found that the most highly esteemed treasure is after all the greatest sham. With a shout of triumph near the close of his *Homerische Untersuchungen* Wilamowitz used these words: "Homer is now a might, but a vanquished might" ("Homer ist eine Macht, aber eine überwundene"). There is no need to weep beside the bier of fallen greatness; the only regret is that Homer had deceived the world so long.

Herodotus devoted years of patient research and traveled far that he might preserve "for the sake of posterity the remembrance of what men have done, and might prevent the great and wonderful actions of the Greeks and the Barbarians from losing their meed of glory." The fact that he was willing to give honor to the Barbarians as well as to the Greeks might incline one to feel a certain affection for him, but he merits no such esteem, and the critics of our day discuss the Persian War, its numbers and its issues, and ignore the plainest statements of Herodotus, as if there had

<sup>1</sup> Read at the annual meeting of the Classical Association at Nashville, April 2, 1915.

never been a father of history. However, we need not weep for him, since he was lucky to escape so long.

Thucydides for centuries was regarded as the ideal historian, fair, informed, the despair of ancient and modern rivals or imitators, but Müller-Strübing has shown that the history is so improbable that much of it could not have come from Thucydides at all, but must have been put together by dull and incompetent pupils, and that the sieges in Thucydides are rather didactic exercises in strategy than the account of actual warfare.

Cornford has written a book with the highly suggestive title *Thucydides Mythistoricus*. In this book Cornford tries to prove that Thucydides had no grasp on the true causes or issues of the Peloponnesian War, and that his history is largely a piece of imaginative writing based on the poetic models of Aeschylus; also that the various characters therein are moral and ethical forces impersonated. Thucydides was not attempting to write sober history and he could not have succeeded if he had, for he had no adequate conception of the issues involved in that struggle. The friends of Thucydides need not shed their tears for him, but count him lucky to have deceived the world so long.

One of the things so difficult for the layman or amateur to grasp is the reason for the fact that the ordinary workman of Greece labored with such painful accuracy and such high regard for truth that Grecian temples and Grecian columns have for all these centuries withstood the assaults of time, earthquake, and barbarian, so that many of them are still erect (the centuries have not disclosed a single wilful or ignorant lie in the Parthenon), while Greece's great intellectual and literary leaders were at the same time both ignorantly and intentionally mendacious.

However gladly one would go round and pass by all questions of veracity and genuineness, the thing is impossible. The first problem in any writer must be to deal with these. If one discusses the three Greek words *μῦθος*, *λόγος*, *ἔπος*, at once the question arises whether or not *λόγος* is a Homeric word, since the two verses in which it is found in Homer have been rejected by many critics.

If he aims to treat the various words for "necessity," he must at once face the fact that many scholars remove the word *δεῖ* from

Homer. If the use of metals is his theme, he soon finds that every verse carrying a reference to the use of iron in Homer has been condemned, or if he studies the development of armor he must decide whether verses referring to the breastplate are to be regarded as interpolations or original. Many critics have removed from Homer all references to temples, images, the ten years' war, the choice of Paris, the number of the Muses, and even the knowledge of the Fates. How can anyone treat these problems in a competent manner, yet ignore the doubts cast on the authenticity of the very passages on which his problem is based? How different our conception of the Persian War if we regard Herodotus as competent, or as incompetent! The weight to be given to the sober statements of Thucydides depends entirely on the reliability of that historian. If Müller-Strübing and Cornford are correct, then the study of Thucydides is not a matter of historical appreciation but of literary and imaginative enjoyment.

Many of the criticisms and objections are purely subjective and matters of personal sentiment or feelings, and to such there can be no final answer, but some are in regard to matters of topography, geography, or archaeology, fields in which hidden truths are constantly coming to light. In nearly every case these hidden truths, when found, have answered the denials of skepticism and shown the honesty and competency of the classical writers.

Passing by the discoveries which prove the essential accuracy of Homer's description of the site and importance of Troy, the authenticity of the Trojan *Catalogue*, the early knowledge of the Sicels and Southern Italy, I shall limit myself to a discussion of Herodotus and his reliability at his most vulnerable point, namely the size of the army of Xerxes. However staggering the number given by Herodotus might once have seemed, we now regard the hosts of Xerxes with less surprise when we read that Russia has lost by the first of April 2,000,000 men and still has 7,000,000 men in the field.

In no part of the writings of Herodotus are his statements and conclusions regarded with less esteem. Herodotus tells how, after this host had crossed into Europe, 10,000 men were crowded into a compact place, then a wall was built around this space and the

men were counted by filling this inclosure 170 times; accordingly by assuming that the same numbers were crowded therein each time, that is 10,000 men, we reach the total number of infantry as 1,700,000. This is, of course, only a rough estimate and the leaders may have tickled the pride of the king and his zeal for great numbers by counting the inclosure full many times when it was not, or by counting some men twice, so that there would be no discrepancy with Herodotus to increase this number or to diminish it by a few hundred thousand. To the ships he assigns a definite number, then he assumes a rough estimate of added forces from the conquered regions, from the cavalry, the camel- and chariot-drivers, so that he puts the total fighting force at a little over 2,500,000. He assumes an equal number of camp-followers, sutlers, and members of the commissariat, so that he arrives at a total of roughly 5,000,000. These numbers have seemed so out of all reason that most modern writers have ignored them in estimating the size of the army and have reached their own conclusions from what seemed the necessities of the case. Delbrück estimates the number of the infantry at 45,000 to 55,000; Beloch thinks there may have been as many as 100,000; Meyer also thinks 100,000 is the highest possible number of infantry. Herodotus could not have been thus deceived, he must have known better and intended to propagate an untruth, since he was born under the Persian rule before the battle of Salamis and must have had friends who had been members of the Persian as well as of the Greek army, and he had traveled as widely in Persia as in Greece. He knew what the Persians thought of the size of their army as well as what the Greeks thought. Later writers might have exaggerated the numbers, because they had no means of knowing, but Herodotus knew the estimate of contemporaries from both sides. We can put the effective Persian army at 1,000,000 and acquit him of falsehood, but when we bring it down to 50,000 or 100,000 we can have no further use for the authority of Herodotus.

He is not the only false witness in this matter, since Aeschylus plainly vouches for the same numbers. Aeschylus is in every sense a competent witness, he and his family had done their share at Marathon and Salamis, he was over forty years of age when Xerxes



invaded Greece, and soon thereafter he wrote a play for an audience which also knew from experience something of the size of the Persian army. As far as the number of the ships is concerned, the figure given by him is the same as that given by Herodotus, and he too represents the Persian Empire as drained to its utmost in furnishing men for the huge army of Xerxes, using such sentences as these: "All the strength of Asia is gone"; "Nothing now remains in Persia save aged men and women"; "Susa is empty of its men"; "All the people of Persia on foot and on horse is gone like a swarm of bees"; "The Persian wife is left alone"; "Depopulated Asia mourns." This is exaggerated even for 5,000,000, but it is a screaming farce, if the number is less than 100,000. Aeschylus, a participant in the actual fighting, seems to have the same general estimate of the numbers of the Persians as that given by Herodotus.

An inscription, supposed to have been composed by Simonides, was set up by the Amphyctions at Thermopylae to honor the fallen, which inscription puts the number of Persians coming by land at 3,000,000. Whether the inscription be the composition of Simonides or not, it was put up when the facts were still fresh in the minds of all and must have reflected the opinion of that age. If the numbers were only a fiftieth or a thirtieth as great, then this is not exaggeration but insipid nonsense, a disgrace for the men who had fallen, a scandal to the survivors. No man was more eager than Herodotus to prick Greek pride or to show their borrowings from foreigners or the lateness of their supposedly ancient institutions, yet he never exposed their ignorance or imposture in this matter; not only did he not expose it, but he made it his own and connected therewith his name and his reputation.

None in any age were better qualified to speak in this matter than Aeschylus, Simonides, and Herodotus, and they all seem to tell the same story.

The two following generations were hard on the power and the resources of Persia; she not only lost her hold on the more remote provinces, but suffered severely from internal dissensions. The Persia of Xerxes declined much before Cyrus and Artaxerxes contended for the throne. We have an exact and competent estimate of the size of the Persian armies at the end of the fifth century.



Xenophon was a trained soldier who knew how to estimate distances and numbers. All that he says has the mark of a man who knew the facts and had the ability to use them.

When Cyrus decided to contest with his brother for the rule of Persia he made his mobilization by stealth, so that he could attack his unprepared adversary. In this he was fairly successful so that he reached the Euphrates before even the troops in his own army knew his purpose. Everything in this campaign reflects the unpreparedness of the king as the main point in the strategy, not only in the thought of Cyrus but later in the plans of the Greeks.

The theme of the *Anabasis* is the greatness of the Persian forces when assembled, and their present unpreparedness. What was the number of the Persians under these conditions?

The Persians with Cyrus numbered 120,000 infantry, 6,000 cavalry, and 200 scythe-bearing chariots, or about 130,000 fighting men. Of the Greeks there were 10,400 hoplites and 2,500 peltasts. The force under Cyrus was thus close to 150,000 effective fighting men. Here is a force of this size made up from a part of the soldiers who happened to be in Asia Minor. They were only a part of the Persian forces there stationed, since Tissaphernes and his army were not of them.

This army caught the king almost unawares and so accordingly he had but little time to gather his forces. However, at Cunaxa, although the Persians fought in solid squares with deep ranks while the army of Cyrus was well extended in order to present a long front to the enemy, yet the center of the Persians was well beyond the extreme left of Cyrus. Xenophon says that the Persian army then consisted of four divisions each of 300,000 men; one division arrived too late for the battle, so that there were only 900,000 men under Artaxerxes in the actual engagement. All the details of space and arrangement show that Xenophon has given a reliable account of the battle at Cunaxa. When we add to this number the Persians with Cyrus and those forces which arrived after the battle, we can hardly put the army of Persians ready for immediate service at much less than 1,500,000. What might have been the numbers if years had been spent in the muster!

However improbable, even if we accept the account of Herodotus, the exploits of the Greeks at Marathon, Salamis, and Platea may appear, they seem not more wonderful than the deeds of the Greeks at Cunaxa, and their safe return from the encompassing host of the Persians, and that too after they have lost their leaders.

Something happened to the Persians in the first quarter of the fifth century which broke their aggressive spirit. In the last part of the preceding century they had subdued Lydia, Babylonia, Egypt, Asia Minor to the Aegean, and had penetrated far into Europe. Xerxes himself was the son of Darius, his mother the daughter of Cyrus, and thus came of the most warlike blood. Yet something happened which crushed his spirit and the spirit of Persia and made them yield much of their western conquests. What could that have been but some overwhelming defeat, just such a defeat as came to them at Salamis and Platea?

Five nations now at war, France, England, Russia, Austria, and Germany, have each a larger army in the field or ready for service than the numbers given by Herodotus. Indeed we are told that already Russia, France, and Germany have each lost a larger army than the army of Xerxes, yet no one of them is crushed.

Beloch estimates the population of the Persian Empire in the fifth century at between 80,000,000 and 100,000,000—that is, a greater population than that of any nation now at war, except Russia. Take the lowest estimate, or 80,000,000, and Persia could easily furnish an army of 8,000,000. Herodotus tells us that for several years they were gathering supplies and putting them in convenient stations along the way, and that the commissary department had spent years in preparing for the march. In modern warfare ammunition is the great problem rather than men. General French has just said, "The army with the most ammunition will win." It takes more men to keep the army supplied with ammunition and equipment than can be kept in the field. In ancient times each soldier brought his own shield, sword, bow, or spear, so that the question of ammunition never arose, and so accordingly a far larger proportion of the population could be under arms than in France or Germany. This army of Xerxes was intended to be a parade, a display of might, the very size of which would compel submission.

How large an army under these conditions could a warlike people of 80,000,000 muster? A loss of 40,000, or the army of the critics, would never have created a ripple and could never have changed the Persian Empire from an aggressive to a defensive nation. Beloch estimates the population of Greece at 3,000,000 or 4,000,000, while all the Greeks including those in Asia and the islands he puts at 7,000,000 or 8,000,000. All these were potential enemies, and all had at hand arms and equipment. Xerxes had little reason to trust his Greek subjects in Asia, so that his army must be ready and able to overawe a population of over 7,000,000. Does an army of 2,500,000 men seem a large number to be raised in four or five years from a warlike people of 80,000,000?

Herodotus could not have been so ignorant of the approximate numbers as to confuse 2,500,000 with 50,000 or 100,000, since he knew what the Persians themselves thought of the number. Artemisia, the heroine of Salamis, was from his own native Halicarnassus, and he was almost as proud of her and her exploits as he was of the Greeks. No doubt he knew her, at least by sight, and her version of the campaign of Xerxes might well have been the first he learned. Where is this Halicarnassian and Persian estimate of the size of Xerxes' army if not in the pages of Herodotus? Ctesias contributes little or nothing to the story. We may acquit others of falsehood on the ground of their ignorance, but we can make no such a plea for Herodotus. If his numbers are radically wrong, he was not mistaken; he simply lied, for he knew better.

The numbers given by him are not intended to be exact, they are only an approximation, so that we can raise the fighting force to 3,000,000 or lower to 1,000,000 and yet agree with him. When we consider the present armies now fighting in Europe, what estimate must we make of the size of an army sent by a warlike nation of 80,000,000 in order to make the supreme display and the supreme struggle, and an army of such size that its destruction changed the current of that nation's history?

For us to assume in the face of all this that Xerxes had an army only a fourth as large as that of poor little Servia is to make skepticism ridiculous, however solemn and pompous that skepticism may be.

## HIGH-SCHOOL LATIN—A NEW PHASE OF AN OLD SUBJECT

BY E. A. PARTRIDGE  
East High School, Rochester, New York

Many articles have appeared recently in defense of the study of the classics, proving their contention by the recital of the achievements of classical students in related or totally different fields of learning. In the majority of cases the articles have shown conclusively by statistics the superiority of classical over non-classical students. For example, the report of the standings of Princeton students recently compiled by Dean West proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the classically trained men far outranked all others, not only in the arts, but also in the scientific courses, the conclusion being drawn that the superiority thus shown was due to the study of the classics and to nothing else. All such articles have one defect which prevents their entire acceptance by all—namely, the fact that opponents of the classics insist on answering with the simple statement, "Granted, but the classical students are better to start with, for only the men with the best minds study the classics anyway, and we should naturally expect them to outrank all others." To this objection there is no adequate answer so long as the tables of statistics offered in proof are drawn up on the lines ordinarily followed. Only when the question of *original natural ability* is entirely eliminated will this objection be met and the statistics have their full force in support of the classical contention.

The only attempt made to eliminate this factor of natural ability, so far as I know, was in the test of the matter made in the Dorchester High School, the report of whose experiment appeared in the *Classical Journal* of October, 1914. In this case the question of natural ability was eliminated from the outset by selecting two groups of pupils of exactly equal ability as shown by the reports of the term preceding. One of these groups was arbitrarily assigned to German, the other to Latin, the other subjects studied by the

two groups being exactly alike. At the end of the year it was found that the Latin group outranked the German in all lines, showing definitely and conclusively the superiority of the Latin as a means for mind-training. This article is unanswerable. As Professor Holmes of the Division of Education, Harvard University, wrote to Mr. Perkins in a letter quoted in Mr. Perkins' article in the *Journal*, "If it can be shown definitely and in detail, in recorded achievement of pupils, that their study of Latin has done more for them than some substitute has done for *pupils of equal ability*, then the whole discussion of Latin will be finished, once and for all."

To eliminate the question of natural ability from the beginning, by such a plan as was adopted at the Dorchester school, is impossible in the great majority of cases. If, however, we can show in the recorded achievements of pupils *that there is a distinct relation between the standings of pupils in their various subjects and the number of years Latin and Greek have been studied, that the longer the classical studies are pursued the higher is the standing, that there is a direct relation between these two factors, that no substitute for Latin is able to show this relation to such a marked degree*, then the question of natural ability is eliminated in another way. We can, in that case, at once admit that the classical students have the greater natural ability and direct our attack along a different line. Granting that their initial ability is greater, we have merely to show that their advance in other subjects *bears a direct relation* to the number of years the classics are studied, a relation not shown in the case of students who have substituted for Latin some other subject.

Admitting from the outset, then, the greater natural ability of the classical student, this paper will proceed to the proof of the contention stated above. The statistics here presented are based upon a study of the standings of pupils in the Regents' Uniform Examinations in Third-Year English in the East High School, of Rochester, New York, for the five-year period 1909 to 1913 inclusive. As two such examinations are given each year (in January and June), this covers ten examinations, the entire number of papers written being 783. The standings of the papers as revised by the Regents' office were used in obtaining results. The



Third-Year Examination was chosen because it covers definitely all phases of the English work.

The first step in the process consisted in making a complete list of the names of the 783 pupils examined, after each name being entered the standing in the Third-Year English Examination. The school records were then consulted and entry was made of the number of years of Latin, Greek, German, or French each pupil had had at the time of taking the English examination. Thus ordinarily five years was the maximum amount of foreign language, the most common combination being three years of Latin and two of German.

TABLE I

THE ENTIRE 783 PAPERS DIVIDED ON A BASIS OF THE NUMBER OF YEARS  
LATIN WAS STUDIED

No. years studied. ....	0	1	2	3
No. papers written. ....	181	123	220	259
Average standing (percentage) ..	65	65	69	76 7/8

Since this table is based on the number of years Latin was studied it is evident that the column headed 0 includes not only those pupils who had had no foreign language whatever but also those who had studied German or French one, two, or three years, the average standing for these pupils being 65 per cent. Accordingly, this average is higher than it would be if that column contained a record only of those who had not studied any foreign language, for no defender of the classics would hold that the study of modern languages for two or three years would produce no effect on the ability to handle English. The fact that the 0 and the one-year columns show the same average, 65 per cent, is due to two factors: (1) the one just mentioned, that the average of the 0 column is raised by the two- and three-year modern-language students; (2) the average of the one-year column is lowered by the fact that those pupils who drop Latin at the end of one year are for the most part those who have shown themselves so little adapted to language study that they drop or are requested to drop at that time in spite of the school regulation which requires them to continue a language once begun for at least two years. This second



factor, it will be noted, does not enter in at the end of the second or any other year where the demands of the high-school course or college or normal-school entrance requirements determine what subjects shall be continued and where many of our best as well as our poorer pupils drop. The two-year column shows an increase over the one-year of 4 per cent, while the three-year column shows an increase of 11 per cent. Thus the first step in proof of the proposition that increase in ability is relative to the number of years Latin is studied.

Of course, it may now be said that this table is not a fair test since a large number of pupils in the two- and three-year columns had also studied German or French for one or two years, and these could not be entirely without effect. For this reason Table II is presented in conjunction with Table III, the first representing strictly classical and the second, strictly modern-languages pupils.

TABLE II\*

INCLUDES PAPERS OF PUPILS HAVING LATIN ONLY AND NO OTHER  
LANGUAGE TO THEIR CREDIT  
Total Number of Papers, 167

No. years studied.....	0	1	2	3
No. papers written.....	28	25	42	72
Average standing (percentage) ..	63	61	69	78

TABLE III\*

INCLUDES PAPERS OF PUPILS HAVING GERMAN OR FRENCH ONLY AND NO OTHER  
LANGUAGE TO THEIR CREDIT  
Total Number of Papers, 176

No. years studied.....	0	1	2	3
No. papers written.....	28	41	57	50
Average standing (percentage) ..	63	61	65	68

\* It is obvious that the 0 columns in these two tables will contain record of exactly the same pupils.

In comparing the averages here given little account should be made of the 0 column, as these 28 pupils were very unusual special students. The fact that the one-year columns both show 61 per cent is nothing remarkable, for, as before stated, this represents the

work of the decidedly poorer pupils in Latin and German who drop or are requested to drop at the end of the first year. While a 10 per cent superiority over the modern-language group is shown by the three-year column of the classical group, the important thing for us here is the *relative advancement*. The classical two-year column shows an advance over the one-year of 8 per cent; the three-year an additional advance of 9 per cent, or a total advance of 17 per cent; the corresponding advance of the modern-language group being 4 per cent, 3 per cent, and 7 per cent.

Tables A, B, and C are complementary to Table I, II, and III respectively, and show the relative standings by years of the number of papers written. From Table A it will be seen that of the 35 papers reaching a 90 per cent standing, 30 were written by pupils having three years of Latin and the other 5 by pupils having two

TABLE A

ACCOMPANIES I; DIVIDED ON A BASIS OF LATIN AND INCLUDING ALL PAPERS  
WRITTEN—783 IN NUMBER

No. years studied.....	0	1	2	3
Below 60 per cent.....	58	35	34	10
60 to 69 per cent.....	65	45	76	67
70 to 79 per cent.....	41	36	70	84
80 to 89 per cent.....	17	7	35	68
90 to 100 per cent.....	0	0	5	30

years of Latin to their credit. But here, again, the important point for us is the relation between the advancement and the number of years Latin was studied. Again, the relation is easily seen. The failures drop from 58 to 10, the successes increase in the 70 to 79 per cent grade from 41 to 84, in the 80 to 89 per cent grade from 17 through 35 to 68, in the 90 to 100 per cent grade from 0 to 30. In view of this steady increase it can hardly be said that the rise is due merely to a survival of the fittest, to a dropping off of the poorer pupils. While this may have some effect at the end of the first year, such an influence would be entirely offset at the end of the second year by the fact that at this point many of our best pupils drop because college scientific courses or other valid reasons demand a discontinuing of the subject.

Tables B and C, complementary to II and III, and presented for the same reason as II and III, may now be examined. By a comparison of these it will at once be clear that of the 35 papers above 90 per cent, 13 were written by pupils having three years of Latin *and no other foreign language* to their credit, while not a single modern-language pupil touched the 90 per cent mark and only 13 out of the 148 reached 80 per cent. It will also be noted that

TABLE B  
ACCOMPANIES TABLE II—LATIN ONLY

No. years studied. ....	0	1	2	3
Below 60 per cent. ....	13	9	11	2
60 to 69 per cent. ....	11	13	11	15
70 to 79 per cent. ....	3	2	15	23
80 to 89 per cent. ....	1	1	4	19
90 to 100 per cent. ....	0	0	1	13

TABLE C  
ACCOMPANIES TABLE III—GERMAN ONLY

No. years studied. ....	0	1	2	3
Below 60 per cent. ....	13	21	21	6
60 to 69 per cent. ....	11	14	19	17
70 to 79 per cent. ....	3	6	13	18
80 to 89 per cent. ....	1	0	4	9
90 to 100 per cent. ....	0	0	0	0

of the 148 papers written by the modern-language group 48 (32 per cent) were failures (i.e., below 60 per cent) and only 13 (9 per cent) reached 80 per cent, while of the 139 written by the Latin group only 22 (16 per cent) were failures and 48 (34 per cent) were above 80 per cent. Advance is shown, to be sure, in the modern-language substitute, but in nowhere near so marked a degree. Turning again to Table B for relation study, the success is again clearly marked, especially in the three higher grades, rising from 3 to 23 in the 70 to 79 per cent grade, from 1 to 19 in the 80 to 89 per cent, and from 0 to 13 in the 90 to 100 per cent grade.

Let me further translate Tables B and C into percentages (Table Y), which are sometimes more convincing, inasmuch as

a careless reader might judge by the relative numbers only and disregard the fact, for example, that the one-year column of Table B totals but 25 papers while the three-year column totals 72. The percentages, therefore, are based each *on the total in its own column*.

TABLE Y  
INTERPRETATION OF TABLES B AND C BY PERCENTAGES

No. years studied.....	B' Latin			C' (German)		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
Below 60 per cent.....	36	26	3	51	37	12
60 to 69 per cent.....	52	26	21	34	33	34
70 to 79 per cent.....	8	36	32	15	23	36
80 to 89 per cent.....	4	10	26	0	7	18
90 to 100 per cent.....	0	2	18	0	0	0
	100	100	100	100	100	100

The failures in the Latin group, it will be noted, drop from 36 per cent of the one-year papers to only 3 per cent of the three-year, while the successes in the 70 to 79 per cent grade rise from 8 per cent to 32 per cent, and in the 80 to 89 per cent grade from 4 per cent to 26 per cent. Also, of the three-year papers 18 per cent were above 90 per cent and 44 per cent (i.e., 26 per cent plus 18 per cent) were above 80 per cent. The same conclusion must be drawn here—that the advance is in proportion to the number of years Latin is studied, and, further, that Latin is more effective than its modern-language substitute.

I have purposely refrained from mentioning the 60 to 69 per cent grade in the tables until this point for the reason that while, on the surface, there appears to be a curious uniformity in that grade in the three tables, A, B, C, the real relation is strikingly brought out in the percentage table B' which shows a drop from 52 in the one-year column to 21 in the three-year. The corresponding modern-language group shows no change; interpreted, this means that the distinctly poorer modern-language pupils are not affected by their modern-language study either one way or the other.

Ordinarily Latin or German is begun in the first, and German, Latin, French, or Greek in the second year, thus making a maximum possibility of five years of foreign language at the end of the third year when the examination in English was taken. Accordingly I add tables made on a five-year basis of the total foreign language taken (Tables IV and D). Again, obviously the 0 column will simply repeat the 0 columns of Tables II and III.

TABLE IV  
ON A FIVE-YEAR BASIS OF ALL LANGUAGES

No. years studied.....	0	1	2	3	4	5
No. papers written.....	28	70	129	157	142	257
Average standing (percentage).....	63	62	66	68	71	74

The fact that the five-year column shows an average of 74 per cent rather than the 78 per cent of the three-year column of Table II is due to the modern-language pupils here included, whose average has already been shown to be lower than that of the classical. The evenness of the rise in standing *in relation to the number of years foreign languages were studied* is here remarkably well shown.

TABLE D  
TO ACCOMPANY TABLE IV

No. years studied.....	0	1	2	3	4	5
Below 60 per cent.....	13	32	40	33	11	8
60 to 69 per cent.....	11	28	35	53	52	74
70 to 79 per cent.....	3	9	39	43	49	88
80 to 89 per cent.....	1	1	13	26	25	61
90 to 100 per cent.....	0	0	2	2	5	26

From Table D, as from Table A, B, and C, any number of interesting conclusions might be drawn. Note the following: The number of failure papers (below 60 per cent) decreases rapidly after the second year until we have in the five-year column only eight failures out of a total of 257 papers written by five-year pupils. In every other line we have an equally rapid increase, this being

especially noteworthy in the 80 to 90 per cent and the 90 to 100 per cent grades. Note also that of the thirty-five 90 to 100 per cent papers 26 were written by pupils having five years of foreign language to their credit. Further, of these last-named 26 papers 12 were written by Latin-Greek pupils, or, to put it in other terms, 34 per cent of the entire number of 90 to 100 per cent papers were written by Latin-Greek pupils. As these pupils total only 49 in number, this also means that 24 per cent of the Latin-Greek group stood above 90 per cent on the examination in question.

A further analysis of the five-year column gives us some equally interesting results:

1. Average standing of pupils having three years of Latin plus two years of	Per
German or French (184 papers) .....	cent
74	
2. Average standing of pupils having five years of modern languages only	
(13 papers) .....	68
3. Average standing of pupils having three years of Latin plus two years	
of Greek (49 papers) .....	79

The lesson here is self-evident.

In conclusion, let me again emphasize the purpose of this paper. It has not been to show the superiority in other subjects of classical over non-classical students, although this point is readily deduced, but it has been to show that this superiority is *directly in proportion to the number of years the pupil has studied Latin, and that, therefore, the superiority of the classical over the non-classical pupil is due not solely to initial natural ability but to the training he has received in Latin.*



## Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Roxbury, Mass., for the territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States, west to the Mississippi River; Walter Miller, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the Southern States; and by Frederick C. Eastman, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, for the territory west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. This department will present everything that is properly news—occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.]

### Arkansas

*The Foreign Language Section of the Arkansas State Teachers' Association* met in the classical room of the high-school building in Little Rock Thursday afternoon, April 8, with Professor L. E. Winfrey, of the department of modern languages in Hendrix College, as chairman. In the absence of the secretary, Professor H. H. Strauss, of the department of Latin in the University of Arkansas, G. A. Simmons, of the department of classics in Hendrix College, was chosen as secretary. Quite a large number of both ancient- and modern-language teachers were present to hear the following program: "Can Best Results Be Secured by Means of the Direct Method?" "Yes," Miss Fannie Baker, Fort Smith; "No," Miss Mercy Lewis, Little Rock; discussion, L. E. Winfrey. "Is Prose Composition Worth the Price?" Miss Leora Blair, Fort Smith; discussion, Alvin Good, Little Rock. "How Can We Increase the Interest in Modern Languages in Our State?" Miss Winnie Timmons, Conway; discussion, J. J. Harrison, Fordyce. "A Plan for the Study of English Derivatives." G. A. Simmons, Conway; discussion, Miss Catherine Murphy, Pine Bluff. "Our Aim in Modern-Language Instruction," general discussion. "Reconstruction of the Latin Course to Bring It into Harmony with the Twentieth-Century School," general discussion.

The papers were all good and for the most part full of practical suggestions; and the discussion of each was full and interesting. Especially spirited was the discussion of the first and last topics. The consensus of opinion in the first instance was that in both ancient and modern languages our aim was to teach how to read (not translate or speak) and feel with understanding the language, and that the direct method ought to be used only in so far as it helps to this end. In the second case all agreed that Caesar and Cicero must by all means be retained, but that perhaps more interesting selections from the fifth and sixth books of Caesar might be substituted for the less interesting and more difficult portions of the first four books; and that prose composition based

on the previous lesson ought to be taught, a few sentences daily, rather than a long lesson of detached sentences not related to the text read, once a week.

The following Arkansas teachers attended the meeting of the Classical Association at Nashville, April 2-3: H. H. Strauss, University of Arkansas; D. A. Williams, Galloway College; W. D. Reynolds and G. A. Simmons, Hendrix College.

### California

*Los Angeles.*—An interesting entertainment was recently given by the Classical Club of the Los Angeles High School. A Roman banquet was given in the cafeteria of the high school which was attended by about seventy-five guests, including a number from neighboring high schools. The program was given during the progress of the dinner. The dramatic performance consisted of two scenes from the *Aeneid*, cast into dramatic form by Mr. Walter A. Edwards. At the close George D. Kellogg's Latin version of "America" was sung. Each guest was garbed in Roman costume, and Roman banqueting arrangements were observed as far as possible. As the loving-cup was passed, each one rose and gave some appropriate sentiment in Latin, either quoted or original. The paper used for the program and menu was in close imitation of papyrus. The performance is to be repeated by request before the whole body of students. The actors were drilled by Miss Lena Cooper, of the expression department.

*The Classical Association of Southern California* held its annual meeting with the Los Angeles High School on March 20. The program was as follows: "Roman Baths and Aqueducts" (illustrated), Dr. W. D. Ward, Occidental College; "A Tourist's Impressions of Naples and Its Neighborhood," Miss Norma Curtis Wood, Pomona; "The Personality of Julius Caesar," Dr. Monroe E. Deutsch, University of California; Round Table: "Latin Composition," Miss Mildred Price, Covina.

The officers elected for the ensuing year are as follows: President, Professor H. L. Lunt, University of Southern California, Los Angeles; Vice-President, Miss Mary Wentworth, Berendo Street Intermediate School, Los Angeles; Secretary-Treasurer, Miss Norma Curtis Wood, Pomona, California.

### Illinois

*Murphysboro.*—At the Murphysboro Township High School, an exhibit of illustrative work in Latin was recently given, patterned after the exhibit given a few years ago by Miss Sabin at a meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South at Cincinnati. About fifty posters, prepared by the pupils of the Latin department, were on display in the Latin classroom. The exhibit was open for inspection at the time of the meeting of the Southern Illinois Teachers' Association, April 8-10. Considerable interest in the exhibit was manifested by many of the Latin teachers from southern Illinois.

**Kentucky**

*Midway.*—On the evening of April 10, 1915, the students of the Latin department of the Kentucky Female Orphan School, Midway, Kentucky, gave an interesting entertainment under the direction of Miss Nell Whaley, instructor in Latin. The program opened with the ever-loved "Claudeamus Igitur," sung by an invisible quartette. Thereupon the curtains opened upon the Roman Senate, composed of Junior girls, with "Cicero" hurling invectives upon the head of "Catiline" with truly Ciceronian fluency and vim. Then followed a dramatization from Caesar's campaign against Ariovistus—the part in which the Gauls, by their description of the terrible Germans, so frightened the Roman soldiers that they wept, made their wills, and begged Caesar to allow them to go home. The third scene was the study hall, with the teacher absent. The conversations were carried on in Latin. The audience appreciated these brief scenes because, as some said, the pupils spoke Latin as fluently as English. The fourth scene, "The Gods in Council," was a beautiful spectacular effect in costume, with speaking parts that were rendered without an error. The throne draperies, chitons, helmets, shields, spears, sandals, the trident, the lyre, the caduceus, and other emblems of the gods used in the scene, had been made by the girls at a small expense. The entertainment closed with the singing, behind the curtains, of the first eleven lines of Virgil.

**New York**

*Vassar College.*—The Latin Journal Club of Vassar College was founded March 6, 1902; the charter members were Miss Clemence Hamilton, Miss Grace H. Macurdy, Mr. J. Leverett Moore, Miss Elizabeth H. Palmer, Miss Catharine Saunders, Miss Winifred Warren. The following have since been added: Misses Emily H. Dutton, Elizabeth H. Haight, Grace Guthrie, Mary B. Peaks, Elizabeth M. Perkins, Ida C. Thallon, Abby Leach, Florence M. Bennett, Florence A. Gragg, Lily R. Taylor, Ethel H. Brewster, Katharine M. Cochran.

The club meets at the houses of the members every other week, or about twenty times a year; it has held in all 269 meetings. The object of the club's formation was to aid the members in keeping up with the journal literature in Latin, and with that end in view the principal classical journals were assigned to the various members of the club and the reports upon these constituted the leading part at the club meetings. The club has also listened to letters and accounts of excavations and visits to classical sites—the Palatine, Hadrian's Wall, and Newstead—and to reports of the annual meetings of philological and archaeological societies. Another important feature has been the reviews of books often prepared for publication in classical journals. At one time the club took up the lives of great classical scholars—Bentley, Porson, Jowett, Erasmus, Melancthon, and Casaubon—or read the plays of Plautus or read and discussed in Latin—*colloquia Latina*—an oration of Cicero (*Pro rege*

*Deiotaro*) or one of his philosophical works (*De natura deorum*). It has also considered topics of somewhat wider interest, such as the relation of the College Entrance Examination Board to the new requirements in Latin and the comparative efficiency of the four usual modes of entering college—College Entrance Examination Board, Regents, certificate, or a combination—as tested by the Latin marks of the Freshman year.

The following papers have been read before the club and in a number of cases subsequently published: Miss Haight: "Horace as an Advocate of the Simple Life"; "An Experience with the *Aeneid*"; "Are the *Epistles* of Horace Poetry?" "The Site of Horace's Farm"; "The Story of Cupid and Psyche in Ancient Art"; Miss Macurdy: "The *Heracleidae* of Euripides"; "Vergil's Use of *Märchen* from the *Odyssey*"; "The Giant Rhoeteus in Horace C. 2. 19"; "The Greek Spirit and the Poetry of Arnold and Swinburne"; "The Connection of Paeon with Paeonia"; Mr. Moore: "The Idea of Immortality among the Greeks and Romans"; "The Relief of Children under the Empire"; "Roman Banking under the Republic"; "University Life in the Third Century A.D."; "The Provincial Councils of the Roman Empire"; Miss Peaks: "The Date of the Duenos Inscription"; Miss Saunders: "Altars on the Roman Stage"; Miss Taylor: "The Religious Cults of Ostia"; Miss Thallon: "The Date of Damophon."

Professor Gilbert Murray of Oxford University, Professor James S. Reid of Cambridge University, Professor Charles E. Bennett of Cornell University have been entertained as guests of the club.

### Ohio

*Wilmington.*—Wilmington College has organized a classical club under the supervision of M. Elsie McCoy, professor of Latin. The meetings thus far have been interesting and valuable. At the last meeting of the club Denver Williams, a student, described his visit to the Catacombs and illustrated his talk with postal cards procured at Rome.

### Pennsylvania

*The Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Liberal Studies* held its second annual meeting at the Drexel Institute, March 27, with an attendance of about two hundred members and friends of the society. Among those present from the University of Pennsylvania were Professor J. C. Rolfe, Professor W. B. McDaniel, and Assistant Professor G. D. Hadzsits, of the department of Latin; Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of the department of Semitics; Assistant Professor H. L. Crosby, of the department of Greek; Assistant Professor R. G. Kent, of the department of Indo-European philology; Dr. Edith H. Hall, of the University Museum; and a great number of present and past students of the University.

The morning session was presided over by Professor Walter Dennison, of Swarthmore College, the retiring president of the society. He first read a

letter from Dr. Hollis Godfrey, president of Drexel Institute, expressing his deep regret that a call to the West prevented him from welcoming the society, and emphasizing the idea that the educations styled liberal and vocational respectively are not exclusive of each other, but supplementary the one to the other. Following this, Dean Arthur J. Rowland, of the Institute, welcomed the society to the halls of the Institute and expressed the belief that the meeting of those who champion the liberal studies, in the Institute devoted to the vocational studies, would be of mutual benefit to both parties.

After a happy response to this word of greeting, Professor Dennison reviewed the work of the society for the past year, which lay mainly along the lines of four committees: membership, publicity, program, lectures. There are now nearly four hundred members; publicity has been secured both in the daily press and by a pamphlet describing the organization meeting; four meetings have been held, one of them jointly with the Friends' Educational Association; and a large number of lectures, many of them illustrated, are offered by members of the society, without charge except for expenses, which may be secured by schools and other organizations for the purpose of rousing interest in the liberal studies. Professor Rolfe was elected president of the society for the ensuing year.



## Book Reviews

*Ancient Greece.* By H. B. COTTERILL. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1914. Pp. xxiv+499 with 153 plates. \$2.50.

Perhaps the most noticeable thing about this work is its elaborate illustrations. There are four full-page maps, five beautiful colored plates of Greek vases, seven plates of coins, and one hundred and forty-one full-page half-tones. These plates are excellently described in the list of illustrations, the descriptions in some cases being quite elaborate. The plates executed in color are exceedingly attractive; the half-tones are well chosen and just miss being beautiful illustrations. They are printed in tinted ink and often lack the clear metallic effect of a half-tone, while falling far short of the soft beauty of the photogravure which it is intended to imitate. In spite of this fact it must be conceded that this is one of the most satisfactorily illustrated histories of Greece which has appeared recently.

This volume covers the history of Greece from the earliest times to the destruction of Thebes by Alexander. The work consists of nine chapters, at the close of each of which are certain "sections." The narrative is carried forward in the main part of the chapter (often shorter than the "section"), and such subjects as art, literature, and philosophy are treated in the "sections." This arrangement is apparently an admirable one, but when the reader estimates the amount of space actually given to a particular period he finds it amazingly short. The Peloponnesian War, for example, covers nineteen pages, while the "sections" devoted to the writers, the philosophy and the sculpture of the time cover forty-one pages. Perhaps this is as it should be after all, for the history of Greece was not written in blood, but in art.

The author's attitude toward the traditional myths is one of sympathetic belief. The Trojan War is (with Bury) accepted as history (p. 7). The shaft-graves at Mycenae are supposed to belong to the Aegaeon civilization and the beehive graves to the Achaean (p. 12). The invaders who destroyed the Aegaeon civilization are believed to have been Achaean. Homer is not only personal, but (after Mackail) is the author of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. When he reaches more historic ground, Mr. Cotterill places more belief in the ancient historians than do most modern authors. The battle of Marathon is narrated substantially as Herodotus gives it, although the belief in the rotation of command is now generally discarded. In general it might be said that Mr. Cotterill does not contribute to the study of Greek history any new theories or points of view. He has given us, however, a thoroughly readable history which covers the most important facts in the Greek civilization. His outline of Sicilian history in one of the "sections" (p. 404) is distinctly apropos.

When it comes to matters of art we cannot say that we are greatly impressed with Mr. Cotterill's judgment. The Greek "stelae" are hardly pathetic objects (p. 386). Powers has shown convincingly in his *Message of Greek Art* that the frieze on the Parthenon is not the work of Phidias, nor was it executed under his direct supervision, if the latter phrase means that Phidias is responsible for its artistic tone (p. 305). Perhaps the worst criticism is on p. 417: "There is a well-groomed, somewhat dandified air about the god and child." The god to whom he refers is the Hermes of Praxiteles. The statement that the "basilica" (at Pestum) is perhaps more ancient than the Neptune Temple will be accepted without a great amount of question. Careless proofreading must be responsible for the statement (p. 441), "How much more readily would everyone declare that he was a scamp and deserved their anger." In the index Mr. Cotterill separates into two heads Demosthenes the general, and Demosthenes the orator.

LOUIS E. LORD

OBERLIN COLLEGE

---

*Republican Rome.* By H. C. HAVELL. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1914. Pp. xxiv+564. \$2.50.

This work belongs to the same series as Cotterill's *Ancient Greece* and is almost as notable for its lavish illustrations. It contains twelve full-page maps and sixty-five plates. These are all fully described in the list of plates preceding the text. There are no illustrations in color, but the half-tone work is admirable and the illustrations clearer and more satisfactory than in the companion volume. There are a number of plates of Roman coins which are described in the appendix. The narrative is continuous from beginning to end, and the device of "sections" is not employed.

In judging the book it must be remembered that the author died before the work went to press, and that the text, therefore, never had his final revision. The narrative is straightforward and lucid, with no attempt at rhetoric, yet the style does not lack distinction. The book as a whole is readable and gives a satisfactory account of Republican Rome. Like Mr. Cotterill, the author places more confidence in the truth of the ancient myths than most modern historians. This fact is encouraging to all the students of the classics who believe that the ancient myths and legends contain much more truth than is often supposed. How much the author depends on the truth of the legends may be seen in his account of the sack of Rome by the Gauls (pp. 82 ff.). In following the traditional account of Roman history the author has retained some features which might better have been corrected. The conspiracy of Catiline, for example, hardly justifies the amount of space given it. More than justice has been done to Fabius Maximus Cunctator, whereas C. Flaminus receives scarcely fairer treatment than he does at the hands of Livy, or the rest of the Roman aristocratic historians.

When it comes to character sketches the author follows the judgment of Mommsen to a great extent. This is notably true in the case of Sulla and Caesar, while Cicero receives much more charity than he does at the hands of the great German historian.

The Cloaca Maxima (p. 18) is spoken of as the work of Tarquinius Superbus. Modern writers on Roman antiquities would scarcely assign the present Cloaca Maxima to that period. Livy should hardly be represented as believing in the portents which he so religiously chronicles (p. 221). Livy cites these portents in such a way that the reader is left with the impression that they are included for the sake of anyone foolish enough to believe them, as well as for completeness. Marius is said to remain a "new man" still at the age of forty-seven (p. 380). This is misleading, for of course he would remain a "new man" throughout his life under any circumstances. It hardly seems (p. 389) that the assignment of lands to Italians was a tacit admission of Roman citizenship. One would like to have had the Roman literature more fully treated. Sallust is not mentioned in his capacity as a historian, nor do we find reference to the historical work of Caesar. Another important omission is Rome's contribution to architecture, though this may perhaps be justifiable, as the great monuments belong to a period beyond the scope of this work.

The work as a whole makes no new contribution to our knowledge of Roman history, for this is scarcely the author's intention. It is, however, one of the most satisfactory single-volume histories of Republican Rome for the average reader.

LOUIS E. LORD

OBERLIN COLLEGE

---

*Outlines of Ancient History.* By HAROLD MATTINGLY. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Pp. xii+482, with maps and illustrations. \$2.50.

There are two ways in which outline history may be written. The salient facts of a period may be selected and treated with considerable fulness, or the author may cover the same period in detail, without emphasizing to any great degree the most important facts. Mr. Mattingly has chosen the latter course. The book covers ancient history in the ordinary acceptance of that term, that is, "the history of the Nearer East, of Europe and the north of Africa, but excluding the outlying civilizations of China and India" (p. 3). The work ends with the fall of the Western Empire in 476 A.D., although Leo the Great and Zeno the Isaurian (died 491) are also treated. The charge to which any author following this plan lays himself open is that in giving an abundance of detail and omitting few facts, the more important features of history become obscured. This is true to a certain extent in this history. Examples which might easily be multiplied are the Greek migrations (p. 86), and the Greek colonies (p. 123). The book is mainly useful as a reference book, and not as

a readable history of the periods covered. By this I do not mean that the history is dull or poorly written, for this is not the case; but the reader is often confused by the multiplicity of detail, which in some cases is hardly more than enumeration.

The book is concerned mostly with the events of political history. Mr. Mattingly says (p. 137) that after a digression on the characteristics of the Age of Pericles "we must now return to our proper task." In writing this political history Mr. Mattingly does not profess to be impartial and dispassionate (p. 3), for he believes that no writer of history can fulfil his duty and be impartial. In this he seems to me entirely right. The historian has no violent bias in favor of or against any of the well-known characters of history. His opinions of the great men of the Republican and Imperial Age agree with those of Mommsen. Cicero is treated with greater respect and Caesar with less admiration, but there is no attempt to create new ideas of these well-known characters. The mythical history of Greece is treated with greater respect in accordance with the tendency of modern historians. Mr. Mattingly doubts the existence of a personal Homer (p. 63), but in his discussion of the battle of Marathon he follows Herodotus rather than Bury. The moot points about the battle of Thermopylae are not alluded to, and this is wise in a history of this scope. Belôch's theory about the Dorian migration could also have been spared (p. 55). If the book is intended for readers unfamiliar with ancient history, some elementary explanations might have been added; for instance, the term polemarch, the place of the chorus in a Greek play, and possibly Aeschylus and Pindar need a few well-chosen words of introduction (p. 112).

The plates of coins which close the book are admirably chosen and executed. The maps suffer, however, because printed on paper which is too thin. One would welcome an index of things as well as of persons. The statement that the Athena Promachus was made of gold and ivory (p. 133) is certainly a misprint.

LOUIS E. LORD

OBERLIN COLLEGE

---

*Roman Imperialism.* By TENNEY FRANK. New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. ix+365. \$2.50.

Dr. Frank states in his preface that his "purpose has been to analyze, so far as the fragmentary sources permit, the precise influence that urged the Roman republic toward territorial expansion." It is a rather large task that Dr. Frank sets for himself, for the history of Rome's territorial expansion is the history of Rome without a few of the "frills."

Since the subject is so large and the sources so fragmentary, it is clear that two qualities must be essential for the composition of a book on this subject: (1) the ability to condense and to exclude the non-pertinent, and (2) the ability to interpret the evidence sanely and critically.

As to Dr. Frank's ability to condense and to exclude the non-pertinent, it is perhaps sufficient to note that he treats his subject adequately and thoroughly within 365 pages. But the ability to interpret the evidence sanely and critically is the *sine qua non* of a book of this kind, especially since the sources for this subject are so fragmentary and the evidence often is biased. The Roman historians and writers concerned themselves very little with imperialism; they were more interested in the military history connected with Rome's expansion of territory than they were interested in Rome's theories of expansion or excuses for expansion. And they too often allowed their narratives to be colored by their own actual or traditional family and political affiliations. Hence their statements must be critically examined and estimated, even when they seem concise and precise. It is this ability to interpret evidence which is Dr. Frank's strongest point in my opinion. He often refuses to accept the commonly accepted view of a situation, and always convinces the reader that his refusal is well founded. He fortifies and illuminates his views by a series of explanatory and critical notes and citations appended to each of the twenty-eight chapters. These notes constitute a very valuable feature of the book and are not to be passed over lightly. They indicate a very thorough handling of the material.

Briefly, Dr. Frank's thesis is that a definite policy of imperialism or territorial expansion was unknown to the Romans until late in the republic. Pompey was the first real imperialist, Caesar the second. The book does not deal with the empire except for a sketch-like chapter of about ten pages. One might wish that the empire had been more fully treated.

Dr. Frank completely convinces me that his thesis is correct, but I must admit that I have for some time inclined toward this belief. He may not succeed in converting those who see a spirit of "imperialism" in Rome's earlier foreign policy. I think he should convert to his belief everyone who reads his book, but he may not. However, anyone must admit, I believe, that Dr. Frank has handled his material in an admirable manner, and that he has won a place in the first ranks of Americans who are working in ancient history.

E. W. MURRAY

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

---

*Greek and Roman Sculpture.* By A. FURTWÄNGLER and H. L. URLICHS. Translated by HORACE TAYLOR. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Limited; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1914. Pp. x+241, 60 plates, 73 smaller illustrations. \$2.50.

This is a small edition of a large work in folio form and was issued first in 1898. The present English translation is made from a third German edition, revised and enlarged by Dr. Urlichs, since the death of the lamented Furtwängler. The book does not present a full history of the subject, though



attention is paid to chronological order and the entire field is covered. The monuments are treated in groups and not by periods. Each group is introduced by a broad, generalized treatment of the theme and of the examples which compose the group. These examples are then discussed separately at greater length, somewhat as in Wolter's *Gipsabgüsse* and Helbig's *Antiquities of Rome*. Besides the scientific data presented, these descriptions receive an added value and interest from Furtwängler's brilliancy of interpretation and, sometimes, daring conclusions. Dr. Ulrichs often tempers the latter by recognizing opposing views. For example, in a footnote is the statement that Furtwängler's "Lemnian Athena of Pheidias" "is now considered the work not of Pheidias but of an Attic or Peloponnesian contemporary."

The book is divided into ten parts or chapters. The first part treats of "Ancient Greek Art," and the last, of "Greek and Roman Portraits." The chapters and the treatment of examples vary considerably in length. Forty-seven pages are given to the last chapter, and ten to each of chaps. v and ix, on "Statues of Athletes," and "The Historical Art of the Romans." Eleven pages are given to the Aegina sculptures and nine to the so-called Lemnian Athena; but it was to be expected that more extended treatment should be given to these sculptures by these authors.

One does not look for the usual in the work of Professor Furtwängler, and is therefore not disturbed to find, for example, four pages given to the Asclepius of the Naples National Museum in the chapter on "The Gods of the Fifth Century," and no place given to the Nike Balustrade, Phigaleia, the Mausoleum, Pergamon, nor to the Amazons or the Aphrodite of Melos.

The work of the translator and editor is not without fault. There is some awkward English and now and then an obscure sentence. Errors may be found in punctuation, capitalization, and omission of Greek accents. Words introduced from foreign languages are not italicized, and there are some word inconsistencies; e.g., "Delos" and "Delus," "stele" and "stela," "acroteria" and "acroteros," and some unusual spellings, as "citharodus" and "Polycletus." The Lysicrates Monument is called the Lysicrates statue; the Plutos on the arm of Eirene is described as "the demon of the kingdom." The illustrations are unusually good for the most part; the footnotes and references are plentiful and there are numerous quotations in the text, all of which are translated into English. In some places revision seems to have been overlooked; e.g., "recently" is hardly the word in referring to the finding of the female figures on the Acropolis. The book lacks an index, which is the more needed because of the lack of an adequate table of contents. These faults, while disturbing, are of small consequence compared with the value of a work so largely by the hand of a scholar who was foremost in his field and who will ever live in the affectionate esteem of his students.

WILLIAM S. EBERSOLE

CORNELL COLLEGE  
MOUNT VERNON, IOWA

*Homer, Dichtung und Sage. Erster Band: Ilias.* By ERICH BETHE. Leipzig: Teubner, 1914. Pp. x+372. M. 8.

In this book, the first of a proposed series of three, the author argues that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were known in their present form before the middle of the sixth century B.C., that they are unities, and that each part was conceived in the spirit of the whole. "With a single movement the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* advance without pause and without division from the first to the last verse." These poems could never have been formed from previous songs, since songs are brief and direct, while the epic is full and leisurely. "It is not the greater or smaller compass which divides the song from the epic, but the style."

However, there was song before the epic and traditions before either; accordingly the chief task of the author is to feel his way back from the epic to those previously existing songs and traditions.

Professor Bethe detects a difference in the style of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and believes that the traditions of the *Iliad* were already in verse, while those of the *Odyssey* were still in prose.

The poet in either case was master of his material and his tools, thus he was able so completely to change, expand, or expurge his originals that they can hardly be detected in the finished whole. A starting-place is found in the fact that Achilles in the presence of the ambassadors spurned the proffered gifts, yet seems eager for them when sending Patroclus to battle. The author assumes that there must have been here two independent sources and thus names one the *Patrocleia*, and the other the *Presbeia*. By dint of keen observation he is able to disengage other songs or smaller epics and to show how much of the *Iliad* is due to Homer and how much he found in his sources. I am willing to acknowledge the industry and the learning of Professor Bethe, but since I can see no contradictions where he sees them, it is impossible for me to accept either his arguments or his conclusions.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

---

*Days in Attica.* By MRS. R. C. BOSANQUET. New York: Macmillan, 1914. 8vo, pp. 14+348, 17 plates, 3 plans. \$2.00.

To the half-dozen agreeable books in English that hardly more than as many years just past have brought forth to lure our thoughts to the magic land of Greece, Mrs. Bosanquet has added another of no less charm and intimacy. She writes professedly for the leisurely traveler rather than for the technical student of archaeology, but even the latter will find no lack of accurate scholarly knowledge in her most agreeably written pages. The book may well be read before, after, or perhaps best of all during a journey to the regions she so amiably describes. It may even serve as a partial solace to one whose

ocular vision of the delightful land is a desire rather than a prospect. We are conducted to the country of Cecrops by way of Crete, where the recently uncovered remains of Minoan life are pictured, and thence through "the thirsty Argive plain." Athens of course plays the major part in the book, and its history is vividly portrayed from its most ancient days down to and including the present. Not the least interesting, indeed, of Mrs. Bosanquet's chapters are those which treat of Athenian life of today. Nor is the countryside of Attica neglected. The book is to be most heartily recommended in every aspect.

E. T. M.

---

*Cicero of Arpinum.* A Political and Literary Biography, being a contribution to the history of ancient civilization and a guide to the study of Cicero's writings. By E. G. SIHLER, PH.D. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1914. \$2.50 net, delivered.

The publishers announce that "this important work is designed to be a full and comprehensive biography of M. Tullius Cicero." The author in his Preface states as his chief aim "that both the statements of fact as well as the judgments and valuations should be reliable; and to append everywhere a somewhat full citation of sources." This is a large contract, yet it has been carried out fairly well in the text. The annalistic method is followed, and year by year, with some minuteness of detail, are given the events of the orator's life, an interpretation of his acts and motives, and an analysis of his works.

While fully appreciative of Cicero's merits, the writer is not blind to his faults. He admits that he was vain and susceptible to flattery, "like a professional beauty"; that he was timid at times and rash on occasion, inconsistent and rather an idealist than a practical man of affairs. Yet on the whole Dr. Sihler's estimate is distinctly favorable, and he runs not a few tilts with the views of such critics as Mommsen and Drumann. While he was of the middle class by birth, Cicero's training gave him aristocratic sympathies which he never outgrew. The scenes of the civil wars in the eighties filled him with a horror of war and of one-man government which largely controlled his attitude forty years later. He was not a mere orator and politician, but a real statesman. The last five pages of the text give an interesting survey of his character.

Of his more notable contemporaries Caesar is pictured as "the most adroit politician of antiquity." Further, "he knew the power of the sword, if any man in ancient history. But he too knew the venality of most men in public life, and all the scale of prices, better than any other Roman unless we except Pompey and the financier-politician" (Crassus). Our author would not

follow Ferrero in his theory that Caesar was wafted into power by mere accident and circumstance. Pompey is not viewed as a heroic figure. He is "Cicero's powerful and somewhat condescending friend"; a vain man "to whom it was as breath to be reputed the only one" (usually printed "Only one"); whose pride was always his first concern; a master of indirection, pampered by fortune, and helpless when the crisis of his fate arrived. Cato is, of course, a sturdy, stubborn upholder of freedom, but unlovely in some characteristics. Brutus is far from being the pure, unselfish patriot of poetry and tradition; he is rather a grasping usurer, "conceited and condescending, the counterfeit shadow of his infinitely greater uncle, Cato of Utica."

The author evidently has made a profound study of his subject-matter and its sources, and has endeavored to use it fairly. He is courteous to opponents, and even where the reader cannot wholly agree with his conclusions he commands respect. In its content this is a work of real value.

An interesting feature of the style is the prevailing use of some descriptive term instead of a name. Cicero is oftenest "the Arpinate," but figures also as "the nascent orator," "the consular," "the orator," "the advocate," "the man of letters," "the supreme judge of literature," etc. Sulla and Cinna and later the members of the first triumvirate are referred to as "dynasts." Caesar after Pharsalus is "the Regent," Pompey is "the Only one," Crassus, "the financier-politician," Brutus and Cassius, "the Regicides" or "the demigods."

Occasional side thrusts are made at modern conditions: politics often, especially on pp. 188, 333 f.; society, "which in our day prides itself on the omission of the article, . . . in which the feminine element predominates or prevails," p. 228; and archaeology, p. 460.

The book evidently is not intended for young students. While it gives a full account of "what actually happened" (see Preface), the manner of the telling is such as presupposes a good deal of knowledge of the subject on the reader's part. The style is uneven, frequently careless, somewhat heavy, and often Germanesque. There are numerous oddities of phrase, such as "*both the offices . . . as well as their seat [sic] in the senate,*" p. 103; "*so much. . . than,*" p. 199; "*independent from,*" p. 202; "*the consuls were Gabinius . . . while the other consul-elect was Piso,*" p. 202; "*these news,*" p. 212; "*such kind of talk,*" p. 276; "*Rome could not rival with Greece,*" p. 374; "*not all . . . no more than,*" p. 116, and many more.

Some expressions, whether by intention or not, sound very much like slang: "easy money," p. 107; "fine Italian hand," p. 132; "Pompey's address was a frost or a failure," p. 180; "clients were somewhat sore," p. 184 (cf. pp. 198, 298); "Cicero . . . ran away, or, as the political phrase of our land has it, *went fishing,*" p. 193; "on the make," p. 248; "tackle," p. 249; "put on the screws," p. 275; "lambasting," p. 381; "went against the grain," p. 385; "cribbing," p. 437. On p. 403 Cicero's *lxxx detersimus* is rendered "scraped off 80,000 sesterces." If modern slang is meant, why not "raked off" or "cleaned up"?

The spelling of Greek names as a rule takes the form of mere transliteration—Patrai, Soloi, Amphiaraios, Kallimachos, Kybele, Lykabettos, Pharnakes, Teukris, Okeanos, etc.; but this is not carried out consistently, for we meet Polybius, Deiotarus, Athenodorus, and many others with Latin endings. A few occur in both forms—Dionysios and Dionysius, Panaitios and Panaetius, Poseidonios and Posidonius. We also find both Caesarian and Caesarean. In Kelt and Keltic only *K* is used. In a few English words the British forms are preferred ("reflexion," "gaol," "saviour," "labour"), and the verb "marshal" has *-ll*. Many errors, also, which are or may be typographical, mar the work. It is a pity that so good a book was not edited before going to the printer. As it is, the use of capitals, italics, syllable-division in Latin words, quotation marks, and punctuation in general seems to have been governed, not by any definite principle, but by guess or impulse in each individual case. The natural result is a hopeless tangle of inconsistencies.

The extensive bibliography of ancient and modern sources is accompanied by running comment with which the reader may or may not always agree. The index is fairly full and helpful, though the principle on which three different styles of type are used for the page numbers is not quite clear.

H. M. KINGERY

WABASH COLLEGE

---

*The Poems of Gaius Valerius Catullus.* With Notes and a Translation by CHARLES STUTTAFORD. London: Bell, 1912. 16mo, pp. xxxii+286.

A professed academic finds it difficult or impossible to avoid an insufferable tone of condescending patronage when he tries to express his genuine pleasure at the incursion into his own preserves of other than a schoolmaster. Even the figures that he most naturally employs betray his ingrained jealousies. "His own preserves," "his own field," quotha? Whence did he get the right to fence in Hippocrene, and shroud bright Helicon under his dust clouds? Is his pet bag o' bones a Pegasus, and all the rest long-eared thistle-eaters? And if to his wry-faced welcome he subjoin such frank criticism of the stranger's equipment as he would venture in greeting a friend and colleague, his narrow ill will is no longer a matter of merely probable suspicion. In such a sea of troubles is the reviewer of this pretty little volume plunged. The only safety is in making his *salve* loud—and brief.

In 1909 Mr. Stuttaford issued through the same publishers an edition of Catullus with a brief introduction and brief notes. It was professedly for the use of those "whose Latin has become 'rusty' in consequence of the exigencies of a professional or business occupation," and who "would gladly renew their acquaintance with the Latin poets," if they were not plagued with unnecessary erudition as sauce and side dish. The editor might well have added, "and if they might read their poets in a decently printed form." It is a shame that



the lover of ancient literature has to gaze upon such ugliness of feature as most books exhibit. Mr. Stuttaford succeeded very well in his purpose. His book was in charming format, and it was not overloaded with knowledge. If there is irony to be suspected in that last clause, it is solely in the gangrened perception of the academic who reads.

After three years Mr. Stuttaford reissued his text, this time with a prose translation (except in the case of a few poems) confronting each page of the original. The notes were ruthlessly cut down from eighty-nine to twenty-six pages—a master-work of courage that no mere academic could hope to achieve. Everybody knows the extreme difficulty of translating Catullus even passably well. Mr. Stuttaford's translation is uniformly as good as any one has succeeded in making, and sometimes it is very good indeed. I regret that space will not permit the inclusion of some of the neatest brief phrases and connected passages; but it will be a pleasant task for the reader to pick these out for himself. He will find the book an agreeable garden spot. In material form it is substantially improved over even the former edition and exhibits a delightful contrast to the ugly products of the Loeb series.

E. T. M.

---

*The Gothic History of Jordanes in English Version with an Introduction and a Commentary.* By CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW. Princeton: University Press, 1915. 8vo., [6+] 188 pp. \$1.75 net.

Jordanes (or better, *pace Germanorum*, Iordanes) is now the orthodox form of the name of that worthy Goth whom we ancients were taught to call Jorandes. Of his own motion he confesses, as Dr. Mierow reminds us, that he was an uneducated man before his "conversion." Whatever this conversion was (and that is a moot question), we may charitably hope that it had a more marked effect upon the ultimate destiny of his soul than it appears to have achieved upon his literary style, which is atrocious. He claims to have epitomized in his history of the Goths the twelve books on that subject by Cassiodorus Senator, but to have added citations from other sources, and some original matter of his own. This small claim to a bit of originality I am inclined to concede to him; but if we had the work of the venerable and pious pedant whom he chiefly followed, we could doubtless readily dispense with the epitome. Yet in the loss of Cassiodorus we are glad to console ourselves with Iordanes. Even his geographical introduction, with its traditional twisted shape and orientation of Britain, and its mythical description of the marvelous island of Scandza, is charming in content, if not in manner. Whose imagination would not be caught by the mention of "Taprobane, a fair island wherein there are towns or estates and ten strongly fortified cities; and yet another, the lovely Silefantina, and Theros also"? Doubtless fairyland lay

in these places, which, the author mourns, "are not clearly described by any writers." Yet a history like that of Iordanes, which depicts for us Attila, and Alaric, and Gaiseric (as we must now call him), and Theodoric, and gives us a touch of Justinian and his great general Belisarius, affords play enough for fancy, as well as for criticism.

Dr. Mierow translated the *Getica* into English in 1908, and that was its first appearance in our vernacular. He now issues it in a revised form, with an introductory essay of competent judgment on the author and his sources, and a judicious commentary, which I should have been glad to see much enlarged. For the Latin text of the *Getica* we must still turn to Mommsen in the fifth volume of the series *Auctores Antiquissimi*, in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. A few remarks on the grammatical peculiarities of Iordanes are made by the translator. These late Latin solecisms of course are most interesting; but it may be questioned how far the orthography of the much later MSS is to be credited to Iordanes himself, as Dr. Mierow appears to think may reasonably be done.

The translator's English style is distinctly good and readable. Of course he makes no attempt to reproduce or suggest the crabbedness of Iordanes. I hope the book may be added to all historical libraries, and do much toward quickening acquaintance at first hand with the history of the Roman Empire, which, some boys and girls may be surprised to find out, had just as lively and interesting an existence in its later life as when it was new-born.

E. T. M.

---

*Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen. Eudemos von Milet und Verwandtes.* By ERICH ZIEBARTH. 2d ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1914. Pp. viii+178. M. 5.

In the revision of Professor Ziebarth's book, a number of changes have been made and much new material incorporated—the result of constant discoveries of papyri and inscriptions. The general arrangement of the first edition is retained. A text of the Eudemus inscription, with translation and commentary, is followed by brief discussions of the relations between state and school and of school endowment, and the study is completed by a lengthy chapter in which many details are discussed under the catholic title "Aus griechischen Schulen."

The treatise is distinguished by the conscientious and accurate scholarship which Ziebarth brings to all his work. No attempt is made to treat the subject in a popular manner, but the reader who thinks to find a dry-as-dust articulation of dead bones will be disappointed. If he be gifted with the least imagination, the terse sketch will become a picture instinct with life. Not least interesting to the modern school man is the abundant evidence the study

presents that schoolboy nature has changed but little in two thousand years, and that not a few of the pedagogical "discoveries" of these progressive times are really venerable with age.

GEORGE MILLER CALHOUN

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

*A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the University of Chicago.* By E. JAR J. GOODSPEED with the assistance of MARTIN SPRENGLING. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, n.d. [1912]. 8vo, pp. 11+128.

This excellently printed catalogue, prepared with all the scrupulous care for accuracy and scholarship that we have learned to expect from Professor Goodspeed, describes 99 MSS, and adds three letters purporting to be by Raphael, of which the authenticity is at best doubtful. Forty-five of the MSS are Latin and twelve Greek. The rest are divided among various other languages, and include a Saga of St. Olaf in Icelandic, and a Quran in Arabic. Few of the Latin and Greek MSS are of classical authors, but in the Latin list are found a Horace, a Juvenal, a Lucan, and an Ovid (*De remedio amoris*). The Greek papyri and oriental MSS in the Haskell Oriental Museum are reserved for separate treatment.

Perhaps an additional note on the miscellaneous Latin MS numbered 12 (chart., saec. xv-xvi) may not be out of place even here. The MS is of some interest to students of Roman topography, even though it will contribute nothing of scientific value to our knowledge of the texts concerned.

The first tractate in the order of the volume professes to be a part (from books vi and vii) of the *Fasti* of "Sextus Clodius." As a matter of fact it appears to be taken from the *Polistoria* (in ten books) of Iohannes Caballinus de Cerronibus, a writer of the fourteenth century. Excerpts from this topographical part of his work may be conveniently consulted in Urlichs' *Codex Urbis Romae Topographicus* (Würzburg, 1871), pp. 139 ff. The historical preface, which ascribes the first settlement on the site of Rome to Noah, may be traced backward through the Middle Ages to pious epitomators who jumbled together Christian and heathen fancies: the topographical description of Rome which follows depends finally upon the twelfth-century document commonly called the *Mirabilia Romae*, or upon its second edition, the *Graphia aureae urbis Romae*. There are other extant examples of these revampings of *Mirabilia* and *Graphia*. How this excerpt came to have the name of Sextus Clodius prefixed to it I do not know; but this was the age of false attributions of similar works, and I suspect that the original superscription had been omitted from a previous copy, and an enthusiastic scholar filled the evident lacuna by borrowing from antiquity a known name, being prompted in the selection by the analogy of "Sextus Rufus," whom I mention below. It is rather too early to suspect a purposely misleading attribution.

The third member in the MS collection, *Sexti Ruffi de Urbe opusculum*, is another and better known example of a genuine and ancient work posing unwillingly under a false attribution. It is a copy of a document of which the original title is unknown, but which was called as early as the eighth century *Curiosum urbis Romae*—a brief enumeration of the principal monuments of the city in each of the fourteen Augustan regions, together with certain statistical summaries and appendixes. The original compilation dates from the first half of the fourth century. Flavius Blondus (1388-1463) found in the library at Monte Cassino a copy of *Curiosum* apparently without title, but following in the same miscellaneous volume a breviary ascribed to a certain Sextus Rufus. So he attributed the *Curiosum* to the same writer, and this attribution long held sway among scholars.

The Chicago MS is really not a bad copy of *Curiosum*, as such copies go. It is free from mediaeval interpolations, and though it contains, of course, many blunders, they appear to be such as would without undue carelessness arise out of the reading by an unskilled scribe of strange words in a strange hand. They are easily explicable, and most of them (except in the numeral statistics) could be readily corrected, if we had no earlier and better MSS of the document. The text has a number of the characteristic earmarks of one of the good MSS of *Curiosum* (Vaticanus 3227, saec. ix, which lacks title), and must be judged to be of its class. Perhaps it is hardly worth while to determine the genealogy more precisely.

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*The Year's Work in Classical Studies: 1914.* Edited by CYRIL BAILEY. London: Murray, 1915. Pp. xii+187. 2s. 6d. net.

This volume, now appearing for the ninth successive year, is one which no live teacher of classics can afford to be without. It is probably true that no one of us can be a specialist in all of the twenty subjects here represented; but we must be interested in all of them, and deeply interested in some, if we are to do effective work. The volume covers practically every field of classical activity. The articles are brief, more or less popular, and in general well written. They give an excellent summary of the work done and of the more important articles and books published during the year. The present reviewer, who has made a study of book catalogues and notices, is astonished to find how many valuable books on matters of the greatest interest to him have not previously come to his attention.

The editor of the volume for 1913, Mr. Cyril Bailey, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, continues the work for 1914. In the preface he explains that the form and contents of the previous issues have been to some extent modified in this one. The expansion of the work in classical fields has been great in recent years, and the articles dealing with these interests had become too long and too technical for the general reader. In this volume, therefore, only the

more important articles, books, and discoveries are mentioned. This makes it possible to give an account of all the subjects most interesting to teachers of Greek and Latin within 178 pages, and the size of the volume will not be greatly increased in years to come.

The outbreak of the war made very difficult the collection of the material for this issue. Several of the usual contributors were unable to write their articles, and other competent scholars had to be selected on short notice to take their places, but the new contributors have uniformly done their work well. It is noticeable, however, that nine departments have been conducted by the same persons since the beginning of the series, though some of these have been omitted in a few of the volumes. These are: Italian Archaeology and Excavation (Thomas Ashby, director of the British School at Rome), Numismatics (George Macdonald), Papyri (Arthur S. Hunt), Grammar, Lexicography, and Metric (E. A. Sonnenschein), Comparative Philology (P. Giles), Greek History with Greek Inscriptions (Marcus N. Tod, who in previous volumes has written on Greek Inscriptions), Greek Religion and Mythology (L. R. Farnell), New Testament (A. S. Peake), Hellenistic Greek (J. H. Moulton). Six other departments are conducted by the same men as last year: Roman Britain (F. A. Bruton), Sculpture, Architecture, and Minor Arts (A. J. B. Wace), Greek Paleography and Textual Criticism (T. W. Allen), Latin Paleography and Textual Criticism (A. C. Clark), Greek Literature (A. W. Pickard-Cambridge), Latin Literature (E. Harrison and C. E. Stuart). The remaining articles are: Greek Archaeology and Excavation (Dorothy Lamb), Roman History with Latin Inscriptions (C. G. Stone), Roman Religion and Mythology (C. Bailey), Ancient Philosophy (J. L. Stocks), and Modern Greek (A. Thumb).

It is interesting to note that the article on Modern Greek, by Professor Thumb, of the University of Strassburg, reached the editor on the first day of August! Professor Thumb sent also a most friendly letter.

There is not a discordant note in the whole volume. Distinguished praise is everywhere given to the great work of the German scholars. Equal praise is likewise given to American scholars. The list of names of the latter is too long to print here, but it is most encouraging to learn anew that our countrymen compare so well with the rest of the scholars of the world. "Iuvat me quod vigent studia, proferunt se ingenia hominum et ostentant." In particular we may mention the references to the work of the American School at Athens and of the Princeton expedition to Sardis.

The contributions to classical scholarship in 1914 were great, and the account of them in this number of *The Year's Work* is well done. Will there be a number for 1915? As far as can be judged from book notices, very little is being done in classical lines, but all publishers seem to be working with feverish haste to increase the multitude of books on the various phases of the war.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

M. N. W.



## Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City.

- COOK, A. B. *Zeus, A Study in Ancient Religion*. Vol. 1, Zeus, God of the Bright Sky. New York: Putnam (Cambridge University Press). 8vo, pp. 44+886. \$13.50.
- CRESSMAN, E. D. *The Semantics of -mentum, -bulum and -culum*. Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas. Pp. 56. \$0.50.
- DALTON, O. M. *Letters of Sidonius*. Translated into English, with Introduction and Notes. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 8vo, pp. 270, 268. Each 3s. 6d. net.
- DUFF, J. D. *Three Dialogues of Seneca*. (Pitt Press Series.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 8vo, pp. 372. 4s. net.
- EDWARDS, G. M. *Homer's Odyssey, Books vi and vii*. With Notes and Vocabulary. (Cambridge Elementary Classics.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 12mo, pp. 90. 2s.
- FRAZER, J. G. *The Golden Bough*. A Study in Magic and Religion. 3d ed., revised and enlarged. Vol. XII, Bibliography and General Index. New York: Macmillan. 8vo, pp. 544. 20s. net.
- HAIGHT, ELIZABETH H. *Carthage and Hannibal*. An Introduction to the Study of Livy's Third Decade. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. Pp. 23. \$0.20.
- HOWARD, A. A., Editor. *Latin Selections*. Illustrating public life in the Roman Commonwealth in the time of Cicero. Boston: Ginn & Co. Pp. 6+113. \$1.00.
- JONES, P. T. *Livy's Ab urbe condita, Liber III*. Edited with Introduction and Notes. New York: Oxford University Press. 8vo, pp. 281. \$0.90 net.
- KEYES, C. W. *The Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. 8vo, pp. 60. \$0.75 net.
- LAMB, W. R. M. *Clio Enthroned*. A Study of Prose-Forms in Thucydides. New York: Putnam. 8vo, pp. 319. \$3.00 net.
- LANG, A., AND OTHERS. *The Iliad of Homer*. Translated into English. Globe edition, revised. New York: Macmillan. 12mo, pp. 7+506. \$1.75 net.
- LEASE, E. B. *Livy, Books I, XXI, and XXII*. With Brief Introduction and Commentary. New York: D. C. Heath. 12mo, pp. 390. \$1.25 net.
- MAP, WALTER. *De nugis curialium*. Edited by M. R. James. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 4to, pp. 316. 18s. 6d. net.
- MCDEVITTE, W. A. *Caesar's Gallic War and Other Commentaries*. An English Translation. (Everyman's Library.) New York: E. P. Dutton. 12mo, pp. 384. \$0.35 net.

- MEARNS, J. *Early Latin Hymnaries*. An Index of Hymns in Hymnaries before 1100. New York: Putnam. 8vo, pp. 20+108. \$1.50 net.
- MINNS, E. H. *Scythians and Greeks*. A Survey of Ancient History and Archaeology on the North Coast of the Euxine from the Danube to the Caucasus. New York: Putnam. 4to, pp. 40+720. \$20.00 net.
- PESKETT, A. G. *Caesar, De bello civili, Book ii*. (Pitt Press Series.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 12 mo, pp. 100. 2s. 6d.
- RAMSAY, G. G. *The Histories of Tacitus*. An English Translation, with Introduction, Notes, Frontispiece, Maps, and Index. London: J. Murray. 8vo, pp. 540. 15s. net.
- ROBERTSON, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. New York: Doran. 8vo, pp. 40+1,360. \$5.00.
- SANDYS, J. E. *A Short History of Classical Scholarship, from the 6th Century B.C. to the Present Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 8vo, pp. 472. 7s. 6d. net.
- SMITH, JEANIE O. D. *The Seal of Hellas*. A classical drama. Boston: Sherman, French. Pp. 80. \$1.00 net.
- SNYDER, W. L. *The Military Annals of Greece*. From the Earliest Times to the Beginning of the Peloponnesian War. 2 vols. Boston: Badger. Pp. 9+692. \$3.00 net.
- STEWART, MARY. *Selections from Catullus*. Translated into English Verse, with an Introduction on the Theory of Translation. Boston: Badger. Pp. 71. \$1.00 net.
- TAYLOR, H. V. *Conspectus, or Latin at Sight Complete*. New York: Macmillan. 8vo, 2s. 6d., or in two parts, each 1s. 6d.
- THALLON, LIDA C. *Readings in Greek History, from Homer to the Battle of Chaeronea*. A Collection of Extracts from the Sources. Boston: Ginn & Co. 8vo, pp. 29+638. \$2.00.
- WILD, H. D., AND OTHERS. *Notes on A Selection of Latin Verse*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 16mo, pp. 63. \$0.40 net. (Complete edition, text and notes, \$1.00 net.)

## GENERAL INDEX

	PAGE
A Day on the Lago di Garda (Elizabeth Hazelton Haight) . . . . .	79
Address at the Laying of the Cornerstone of the Classics Building at the University of Chicago (William Gardner Hale) . . . . .	387
Archaeology in 1913 (George H. Chase) . . . . .	99, 147
 BOOK REVIEWS:	
<i>Flagg, Charles A.</i> , A List of American Doctoral Dissertations Printed in 1912 (W. A. Heidel) . . . . .	85
<i>Bailey, Cyril</i> , The Year's Work in Classical Studies: 1913 (H. D. Brackett) . . . . .	86
<i>Reid, James S.</i> , The Municipalities of the Roman Empire (F. B. Marsh) . . . . .	88
<i>Fowler, W. Warde</i> , Roman Ideas of Deity (K. Preston) . . . . .	89
<i>Instructors in Latin in Williams College</i> , A Selection of Latin Verse (K. Preston) . . . . .	90
<i>Burnet, John</i> , Greek Philosophy (George Miller Calhoun) . . . . .	90
<i>Manatt, J. Irving</i> , Aegean Days (Louis E. Lord) . . . . .	91
<i>Hubbell, Harry Mortimer</i> , The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius, and Aristides (Samuel Eliot Bassett) . . . . .	92
<i>Waldstein, Sir Charles</i> , Greek Sculpture and Modern Art (S. O. Dickerman) . . . . .	93
<i>Ballou, Susan H.</i> , The Manuscript Traditions of the <i>Historia Augusta</i> (B. L. Ullman) . . . . .	94
<i>Gudeman, Alfred</i> , P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus (E. T. M.) . . . . .	183
<i>Lawrence, L.</i> , Manuel des études grecques et latines (E. T. M.) . . . . .	184
<i>Verrall, A. W.</i> , Collected Literary Essays, Classical and Modern (E. T. M.) . . . . .	184
<i>Morey, Charles R.</i> , East Christian in the Freer Collection (E. J. G.) . . . . .	185
<i>Gardner, Percy</i> , The Principles of Greek Art (William D. Gray) . . . . .	186
<i>Lamb, Walter R. M.</i> , Clio Enthroned (George Miller Calhoun) . . . . .	188
<i>Martin, Ernest Whitney</i> , The Birds of the Latin Poets (Dean P. Lockwood) . . . . .	190
<i>Norton, Richard</i> , Bernini and Other Studies in the History of Art (Francis W. Kelsey) . . . . .	236
<i>Smyth, Austin</i> , The Composition of the <i>Iliad</i> (John A. Scott) . . . . .	238
<i>Clark, Albert C.</i> , Recent Developments in Textual Criticism (B. L. Ullman) . . . . .	239
<i>Raeder, A.</i> , L'Arbitrage international chez les Hellènes (W. A. Oldfather) . . . . .	278
<i>Geffcken, Johannes</i> , Kaiser Julianus (W. A. Oldfather) . . . . .	279
<i>Murray, Gilbert</i> , Four Stages of Greek Religion (Campbell Bonner) . . . . .	281
<i>Fairbanks, Arthur</i> , Athenian Lekythoi with Outline Drawing in Matt Color on a White Ground (F. B. Tarbell) . . . . .	283
<i>Fischer, Wolfgang</i> , Das römische Lager insbesondere nach Livius (Clifford P. Clark) . . . . .	284
<i>Code, Grant H.</i> , When the Fates Decree (B. L. Ullman) . . . . .	284
<i>Collerill, H. B.</i> , Ancient Greece (Louis E. Lord) . . . . .	418
<i>Havell, H. C.</i> , Republican Rome (Louis E. Lord) . . . . .	419
<i>Mattingly, Harold</i> , Outlines of Ancient History (Louis E. Lord) . . . . .	420
<i>Frank, Tenney</i> , Roman Imperialism (E. W. Murray) . . . . .	421

	PAGE
<i>Furtwängler, A., and Ulrichs, E. W.</i> , Greek and Roman Sculpture (William S. Ebersole) . . . . .	422
<i>Beihe, Erich</i> , Homer, Dichtung und Sage: Ilias (John A. Scott) . . . .	424
<i>Bosanquet, Mrs. R. C.</i> , Days in Attica (E. T. M.) . . . . .	424
<i>Sihler, E. G.</i> , Cicero of Arpinum (H. M. Kingery) . . . . .	425
<i>Stuttaford, Charles</i> , The Poems of Gaius Valerius Catullus (E. T. M.) . .	427
<i>Mierow, Charles Christopher</i> , The Gothic History of Jordanes in English Version with an Introduction and a Commentary (E. T. M.) . . . .	428
<i>Ziebarth, Erich</i> , Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen. Eudemos von Milet und Verwandtes (George Miller Calhoun) . . . . .	429
<i>Goodspeed, Edgar J.</i> , A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the University of Chicago (E. T. Merrill) . . . . .	430
<i>Bailey, Cyril</i> , The Year's Work in Classical Studies: 1914 (M. N. W.) .	431
CURRENT EVENTS	
Classical Associations and Meetings:	
The Classical Section of the New York State Teachers' Association . . .	141
The Classical Section of the Texas State Teachers' Association . . . .	143
The Latin Teachers' Round Table of the Iowa State Teachers' Association	180
The Latin Section of the Nebraska State Teachers' Association . . . .	181
The Western Massachusetts Section of the Classical Association of New England . . . . .	181
The American Philological Association . . . . .	193
The Connecticut Section of the Classical Association of New England .	234
The Classical Association of the Middle West and South . . . . .	241
The Classical Association of New England . . . . .	244
The Classical Association of the Pacific Northwest . . . . .	275
The Classical Association of Kansas and Western Missouri . . . . .	332, 383
The Eastern Massachusetts Section of the Classical Association of New England . . . . .	333
The Twenty-seventh Educational Conference of Academies and High Schools with the University of Chicago—the Classical Section . . . .	382
The Foreign Language Group of Arkansas State Teachers' Association .	413
The Classical Association of Southern California . . . . .	414
The Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Liberal Studies . . . .	416
Classical Societies and Clubs:	
The Chicago Classical Club . . . . .	44, 179, 274
The Latin League of Wisconsin Colleges . . . . .	44
The Classical Club of Lewis Institute . . . . .	179, 331
The Mount Holyoke Classical and Archaeological Club . . . . .	181
The Classical Club of Hunter College . . . . .	181
The Columbus Latin Club . . . . .	182, 334
Kirkville State Normal School Latin Club . . . . .	274
The Portland Classical Club . . . . .	276
A Miniature Roman Republic at Oak Park . . . . .	331
The Graduate Latin Club of the University of Pennsylvania . . . .	334
The Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Liberal Studies . . . .	334, 416
The Latin Club of the Union City High School . . . . .	382
The Latin Journal Club of Vassar College . . . . .	415
The Classical Club of Wilmington College . . . . .	416
Classical Plays and Entertainments:	
<i>Dido—The Phoenician Queen</i> , at Wheaton College . . . . .	42
<i>Orestes</i> , at Radcliffe College . . . . .	42
<i>Medea</i> , at Wellesley College . . . . .	42
<i>Phormio</i> , at Groton School . . . . .	42
<i>A Roman School</i> , at South High School, Columbus . . . . .	42

	PAGE
<i>A Roman Wedding</i> , at Emporia . . . . .	46
<i>Sortes Vergilianae</i> and other entertainment, at Hendrix College . . . . .	46
<i>A Roman School</i> , at Little Rock . . . . .	47
A Vestal Virgin Drill, at Little Rock . . . . .	47
A Roman Sacrificial Procession, at the University of Idaho . . . . .	138
A Dramatization of the <i>Iliad</i> , at the Kansas Wesleyan University . . . . .	140
The <i>Lysistrata</i> , at Cleveland . . . . .	142
<i>A Roman School</i> , at Coronal Institute . . . . .	142
<i>A Roman Wedding</i> , at Brattleboro High School . . . . .	143
<i>Dido—The Phoenician Queen</i> , at Baraboo . . . . .	144
The <i>Captive</i> , at Simpson College . . . . .	180
<i>A Roman Wedding</i> , at LaGrange High School . . . . .	233
A Mock <i>Contio</i> , at LaGrange . . . . .	233
<i>Pyramus and Thisbe</i> , at Kirksville . . . . .	274
The Pageant of Hades, at Lewis Institute . . . . .	331
<i>A Roman Wedding</i> , at the University of New Mexico . . . . .	333
<i>A Roman Wedding</i> , at Tacoma . . . . .	336
The <i>Electra</i> , at Bessie Tift College . . . . .	381
The <i>Alcestis</i> , at Rochester East High School . . . . .	383
A Roman Banquet at the Los Angeles High School . . . . .	414
Entertainment at Midway, Kentucky . . . . .	415
Communication from Albert W. Van Buren . . . . .	41
The Harold W. Johnston Memorial Fund . . . . .	43
The Latin Prize Scholarship Examination at the University of Chicago . . . . .	43
Miss Sabin's Exhibit at Little Rock . . . . .	46
"Origin of Deponent Verb," a Skit from the Medill High School . . . . .	138
Collateral Work at the LaGrange High School . . . . .	139
Lantern-Slide Lectures at the University of Iowa . . . . .	140
Lectures at Brown University at the Celebration of Its One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary . . . . .	182
Questionnaire by the Latin Department of the University of Iowa on High-School Enrolment in Latin . . . . .	234
Classical Charts at the Toledo High School . . . . .	235
Answers to Questions . . . . .	276
An Ancient Recipe for Cake . . . . .	333
A Classical Exhibit at the Glenville High School . . . . .	384
A Classical Exhibit at Murphysboro . . . . .	414
EDITORIALS:	
The College Entrance Examination Board's Latin Papers in June, 1914 . . . . .	1
The Direct Method . . . . .	49
Prophet or Profit? . . . . .	97
Latin and Greek in Education . . . . .	145
The American Philological Association . . . . .	193
A Bureau of Information . . . . .	194
The Annual Meeting . . . . .	241
The Committee on Publicity . . . . .	245
The Greatest Good to the Greatest Number . . . . .	289
The Nashville Meeting . . . . .	337
The <i>Journal and Classical Philology</i> . . . . .	338
The Tenth Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of New England . . . . .	339
The New "Classics Building" at Chicago . . . . .	385
General Intelligence and the Problem of Discipline (Laurence Wooster Cole) . . . . .	358
High-School Latin—A New Phase of an Old Subject (E. A. Partridge) . . . . .	404
High-School Latin and the College-Entrance Requirements (B. L. D'Ooge) . . . . .	29
High-School Latin and the College-Entrance Requirements: A Reply (John C. Kirtland) . . . . .	227
In Memoriam: James Irving Manatt (Francis G. Allinson); Charles Wesley Bain; E. W. Coy . . . . .	370



	PAGE
Latin as a Vocational Study in the Commercial Course (Albert S. Perkins) . . . . .	7
Latin Clubs and Their Programs (Bessie J. Snyder) . . . . .	164
Latin in the Freshman and Sophomore Years (Evan T. Sage) . . . . .	252
Latin without Tears (H. M. Bisbee) . . . . .	72
NOTES:	
Note on <i>Iliad</i> ii, 260 (Roland G. Kent) . . . . .	172
A Further Note on the Papian Law (R. W. Husband) . . . . .	174
Hermes' Rôle in <i>Iliad</i> B 201 (John A. Scott) . . . . .	175
The Great Contradiction in the <i>Iliad</i> (John A. Scott) . . . . .	176
The Spartan Repartee in Herodotus vii. 226 (John A. Scott) . . . . .	178
Notes on the Geography of Western Europe (H. E. Burton) . . . . .	270
Envy of the Gods in the <i>Odyssey</i> (John A. Scott) . . . . .	271
The <i>Lex Papia</i> Again (Max Radin) . . . . .	272
The Law of Poetelius on Corrupt Practices at Elections (R. W. Husband) . . . . .	376
Lex Cornelia de Ambitu (R. W. Husband) . . . . .	377
Homeric (Frank Cole Babbitt) . . . . .	378
The Abu Symbol Inscription and Modern Characters (Charles B. Randolph) . . . . .	379
Publicity for the Classics (C. H. Weller) . . . . .	267, 287
RECENT BOOKS . . . . .	48, 96, 192, 240, 286, 433
Rome the Unfinished and Unkempt (Frederic Stanley Dunn) . . . . .	312
Sequence or Harmony of Tenses (Arthur Tappan Walker) . . . . .	246, 291
Slabsides and the Sabine Farm (Elizabeth Hazelton Haight) . . . . .	216
Some Present Aspects of Foreign University Life (Robert V. Merrill) . . . . .	223
The College Course in the Classics (H. V. Canter) . . . . .	51
The Direct Method Again (Frank F. Potter) . . . . .	323
The Ethics of Dactylic and Spondaic Verses in Homer (John A. Scott) . . . . .	326
The Examinations in Latin of the College Entrance Examination Board (Nelson G. McCrea) . . . . .	343
The First Year of Greek (James Turney Allen) . . . . .	262
Influence of Festival Arrangements upon the Drama of the Greeks (Roy C. Flickinger) . . . . .	115, 155, 206
The Modern Making of Ancient History (Ralph Van Deman Magoffin) . . . . .	63
The Other Side (A. A. Trever) . . . . .	106
The Practical Bearing of High-School Latin (H. Rushton Fairclough) . . . . .	126
The Promotion of Centurions in Caesar's Army (Max Radin) . . . . .	300
The Translation Habit (Clifford P. Clark) . . . . .	17
Thoughts on the Reliability of Classical Writers, with Especial Reference to the Size of the Army of Xerxes (John A. Scott) . . . . .	396
Xenophon's Comrades in Arms (Robert J. Bonner) . . . . .	195

GENERAL LIBRARY  
JUN 4 1915  
UNIV. OF MICH.

# The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH  
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

Volume X

JUNE 1915

Number 9

Editorial	383
Address at the Laying of the Cornerstone of the Classics Building at the University of Chicago William Gardner Hale	387
Thoughts on the Reliability of Classical Writers, with Especial Reference to the Size of the Army of Xerxes John A. Scott	396
High-School Latin—A New Phase of An Old Subject E. A. Partridge	404
Current Events News from the Schools and Colleges	413
Book Reviews <i>Ancient Greece</i> , Cotterill (Lord); <i>Republican Rome</i> , Havell (Lord); <i>Outlines of Ancient History</i> , Mattingly (Lord); <i>Roman Imperialism</i> , Frank (Murray); <i>Greek and Roman Sculpture</i> , Furtwängler and Ulrichs (Ebersole); <i>Homer, Dichtung und Sage: Ilias</i> , Bethe (Scott); <i>Days in Attica</i> , Bosanquet (E. T. M.); <i>Cicero of Arpinum</i> , Sihler (Kingery); <i>The Poems of Gaius Valerius Catullus</i> , Stuttgartford (E. T. M.); <i>The Gothic History of Jordanes in English Version with an Introduction and a Commentary</i> , Mierow (E. T. M.); <i>Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen. Eudemos von Milet und Verwandtes</i> , Ziebarth (Calhoun); <i>A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the University of Chicago</i> , Goodspeed (Merrill); <i>The Year's Work in Classical Studies: 1914</i> , Bailey (M. N. W.).	418
Recent Books	433
General Index to Volume X	435

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

AGENTS

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON AND EDINBURGH  
KARL W. HIERSEMANN, LEIPZIG  
THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation  
of the Classical Association of New England, and devoted to the  
interests of classical teachers in schools and colleges

## *Managing Editors*

FRANK J. MILLER  
University of Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER  
University of Kansas

## *For New England*

MONROE N. WETMORE  
Williams College

## *Associate Editors*

GEORGE H. CHASE  
Harvard University

FREDERICK C. EASTMAN  
State University of Iowa

CLARENCE W. GLEASON  
Roxbury Latin School

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN  
East High School, Cleveland

WALTER MILLER  
University of Missouri

JOHN J. SCHLICHER  
Indiana State Normal School

JOHN A. SCOTT  
Northwestern University

**The Classical Journal** is published monthly except in July, August, and September. The subscription price to residents outside of the territory of the two Associations mentioned below is \$1.50 per year; the price of single copies is 25 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. ¶Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. ¶Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$1.65); on single copies, 2 cents (total 27 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$1.74); on single copies, 3 cents (total, 28 cents). ¶Remittances should be made payable to The University of Chicago Press, and should be in Chicago or New York exchange, postal or express money order. If local check is used, 10 cents must be added for collection.

**The following agents** have been appointed and are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C.

Yearly subscriptions including postage, 7s. 2d. each; single copies, including postage, 1s. 2d. each.

For the Continent of Europe: KARL W. HIERSEMANN, Königstrasse 29, Leipzig, Germany. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, M. 7.30 each; single copies, including postage, M. 1.20 each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori San-chome, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 3.50 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0.60 each.

**Claims for missing numbers** should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when they have been lost in transit.

**Business correspondence** should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to LOUIS E. LORD, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to GEORGE E. HOWES, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning subscriptions outside of the territory of the Classical Associations of the Middle West and South and of New England to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

**Communications for the editors** and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors, to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

**Fifty reprints** of articles will be furnished *gratis* to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

# Classical Association OF THE Middle West and South

## Officers of the Association

### President

HERBERT J. BARTON

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, CHAMPAIGN, ILL.

### First Vice-President

CHARLES E. LITTLE

GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS, NASHVILLE, TENN.

### Secretary-Treasurer

LOUIS E. LORD

OBERLIN COLLEGE, OBERLIN, OHIO

### Vice-Presidents for the States

ALABAMA	ALLEN J. MOON,	BIRMINGHAM
ARKANSAS	GUY A. SIMMONS,	CONWAY
COLORADO	RALPH S. PITTS,	DENVER
FLORIDA	JAMES N. ANDERSON,	GAINESVILLE
GEORGIA	WILLIAM D. HOOPER,	ATHENS
IDAHO	HERBERT D. CHENEY,	POCATELLO
ILLINOIS	ELLEN A. FORD,	CHARLESTON
INDIANA	DANIEL D. HAINS,	CRAWFORDSVILLE
IOWA	CHARLES N. SMILEY,	GRINNELL
KANSAS	HOMER K. EBRIGHT,	BALDWIN CITY
KENTUCKY	THOMAS T. JONES,	LEXINGTON
LOUISIANA	MARY L. HARKNESS,	NEW ORLEANS
MICHIGAN	CHEEVER HOYT,	DETROIT
MINNESOTA	ESTHER FRIEDLANDER,	MINNEAPOLIS
MISSISSIPPI	J. BEVERLY F. SHAW,	MERIDIAN
MISSOURI	ARTHUR P. HALL,	SPRINGFIELD
NEBRASKA	OLIVIA M. POUND,	LINCOLN
N. CAROLINA	GEORGE HOWE,	CHAPEL HILL
N. DAKOTA	GUY R. VOWLES,	FARGO
OHIO	EDWIN L. FINDLEY,	CLEVELAND
OKLAHOMA	JAMES W. STURGES,	NORMAN
S. CAROLINA	MINNIE A. GEE,	SPARTANBURG
S. DAKOTA	LOUISE FRENCH,	HURON
TENNESSEE	DAVID R. LEE,	CHATTANOOGA
TEXAS	DANIEL A. PENICK,	AUSTIN
UTAH	ALICE E. ROWE,	SALT LAKE CITY
VIRGINIA	HERBERT C. LIPSCOMB,	LYNCHBURG
WEST VIRGINIA	CHARLES BISHOP,	MORGANTOWN
WISCONSIN	FRANCES E. SABIN,	MADISON

### Executive Committee

THE PRESIDENT, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, SECRETARY-TREASURER,  
AND

WILLIAM G. HALE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, ILL.

WALTER HULLIHEN

UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH, SEWANEE, TENN.

JOSIAH B. GAME

FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN, TALLAHASSEE, FLA.

FRANCIS W. KELSEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, MICH.



## The Classical Journal

is the official organ of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. The Association is organized for the purpose of encouraging the development of the study of the classics; to provide a means of intercommunication between teachers of the classics—whether in the secondary schools, in the colleges, or in the universities of the territory it covers; and generally to promote a unity of thought and action in the broad field of classical teaching. Membership in the Association is open to all teachers of the classics and to others interested in classical studies who reside in the territory covered by the Association. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year, and members receive the *Classical Journal* without further expense. By paying to the Secretary-Treasurer \$2.40 (instead of \$2.00) per year, members will receive not only the *Classical Journal*, but also *Classical Philology*. The subscription price of the *Classical Journal* alone is \$1.50 per year; of *Classical Philology*, \$3.00 per year. The value of these journals to those interested in the classics, either as students or as teachers, cannot be measured by the cost of membership. The advantages involved in this offer should therefore appeal strongly to those who find themselves in this class.

Application for membership in the Association should be made to the Vice-President of the state in which the applicant resides (see list on page three of cover), or to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association.

The next annual meeting of the Association will be held at the University of Chicago.



